A Further

DISCOVERY

Of that Spirit of

Contention & Diviſion

Which hath appeared of late in

George Keith, &c.

Being a REPLY to Two Late Printed Pieces of his, the one Entituled, *A Loving Epiſtle*, &c. the other, *A Seaſonable Information*, &c. Wherein his Cavils are Anſwered, his Falſhood is laid open, and the Guilt and Blame of the Breach and Separation in *America*; and of the Reproach he hath brought upon Truth and Friends, by his late Printed Books, are fixed faſter on him.

Written by way of Epiſtle, and Recommended as a further Warning to all Friends.

By *THOMAS ELLWOOD*.

Prov. 22. 10. *Caſt out the Scorner, and Contention ſhall go out; yea, Strife and Reproach ſhall ceaſe.*

London, Printed by *T. Sowle* at the *Crooked-Billet* in *Holy-well-lane*, *Shoreditch*, and near the Meeting-Houſe in *White-hart Court* in *Grace-Church-ſtreet*. 1694.

BX 7730
E 65
Office

THE LIBRARY
OF CONGRESS

14457
'02

LEB 31 May '04

LSB3 May 04

A Further

DISCOVERY

Of that Spirit of

Contention & Division

Which hath appeared of late in

G. Keith, &c.

Dear Friends,

WHO have received the Truth in the love of it, and have kept your Habitation therein; unto whom the Truth is exceeding precious, and who desire the Prosperity thereof, above all things: Unto you is the Salutation of my endeared love, in this blessed Truth, in which the Fellowship of the Faithful stands. In this it is I desire to know you, to be known by you, and to have Fellowship with you; earnestly breathing to the God of Truth, the Father of Spirits, that he will be pleased to pour forth more abun-

 dantly

dantly of his good Spirit into all our Hearts, and fill us with the bleſſed Fruits thereof; that there may be no room for the Enemy to enter, to break this holy Fellowſhip: But that all, who profeſs to believe in the Light, may ſo walk therein, that a clear ſight they may have thereby, and a true diſcerning between things that differ, and may be able to make a right Judgment, what is of God, and what is not; that ſo the Deſign of that Spirit (by whatſoever Inſtrument it works) which would break, or diſturb the Churches Peace, and caſt Reproach upon the Heritage of God, may be ſo diſcovered and laid open, that all may ſee and ſhun it. As this is the Exerciſe and Travel of my Spirit; ſo it is the Service I have been of late, and am at preſent engaged in. For Friends, It is not many Months, ſince I ſalluted you with an *Epiſtle*, wherein my Spirit was drawn forth *briefly to Commemorate the gracious Dealings of the Lord with his People*; and, as in a general way, to remind you of the many Attempts the Enemy hath made, by Force and Fraud, to hinder the Work of God from going on: So more particularly, to *Warn you to beware of that Spirit of Contention and Diviſion, which hath appeared of late in* George Keith, *and ſome few others that join with him, who have made a Breach and Separation from Friends, in ſome parts of* America. In writing that Epiſtle, I did not conſult Fleſh and Blood, neither had I an Eye to my own eaſe and quiet, as outwardly, (for I had no reaſon to expect reſt from ſo reſtleſs a Man, nor fair Treatment from one, who in his late Writings and perſonal Debates,

hath

hath so notoriously let loose his Pen and Tongue, to an *unbridled liberty* of Railing and Reviling.) But I cleared my Conscience, in discharging my Duty to God, and to his Church, and therein have that Peace, which all his Abuses cannot disturb.

After that Epistle of mine had been sometime abroad, *G. K.* published a Sheet of Paper, which he called, *A loving Epistle to all the moderate, judicious and impartial among the People called Quakers*, &c. In that Sheet he charged me with Fifty Perversions, Forgeries, and false Accusations, which he said he had noted in my Book; but left his Proofs behind, to come after in another Book, which he then threatned should be published, if my Book was not called in and disowned. Some Weeks after the publishing of that Sheet, he hath now sent forth his threatned Book, pretended to be an Answer to that Epistle of mine, and containing his Proofs, (such as they are) of the Charge he had made publick so long before. As soon as I had notice of the coming forth of his last (which he calls, *A Seasonable Information*, &c.) I gave direction for the stopping what I had before written and sent to *London* (in Answer to his other Sheet) chusing rather to make but one work of it, than to multiply Books, as he does; who (notwithstanding his alledging, that the Scripture says, *Of making many Books there is no end*) seems to have an *Itch* to writing, and a *Pride* in Printing.

He begins his Epistle with a double or two-fold Boast. One of his *Labours* and *Services* in

the Truth; to which perhaps I may say something hereafter. The other, of the *considerable Number* of those that (he says) he has *Experience* are in true Unity with him. To which, at present, I shall only say, If that were true, the more were the pity. But as I am far from believing it to be true: So I wish (for his own sake, as well as others) he may be as much mistaken, concerning the number of his Favourers, as those few that do favour him are, concerning his *Sincerity*.

His second page, and part of his third, is in a manner wholly filled with Railing at me. He says, *I labour to take from him his Innocency, and Christian Reputation and Testimony*. Of all which, I think he brought but little (if any) into *England*. What stock of each he carried with him into *America*, he has (I fear) made *Shipwrack* of there. He charges me with *a sordid way of Sophistical Wrangling, Perversions, Forgeries, and false Accusations, to the number of Fifty, and upwards*. This Charge he sent abroad in his Printed Epistle, in *general* Terms, without instancing the Particulars; which he kept in reserve, to furnish out another Book. But was not this a sordid way of Sophistical Wrangling in him, thus to Charge, without making Proof? How often and highly does he complain, in several of his former Treatises, of being charged *in generals*, without producing particular Proofs? In his Plea of the Innocent, *p.* 8. He, with others of his Party, say, *Seeing their Accusations against* G. K. *lye much in bare generals, we see no cause further to take notice of them, —— but to shew, that*

that for want of particular matter againſt him, they thus labour to defame him in bare generals; a way (ſays he) *common to all Sophiſters and falſe Accuſers.* Did he not then take the way which he ſays is common to all Sophiſters and falſe Accuſers, when he accuſed me in *bare generals*, without producing the Particulars? Did he not take the moſt deceitful way he could, when he accuſed me in *bare generals*, ſeeing himſelf ſays (p. 17. of his Plea) *Nothing is more deceitful than bare generals?* It will not excuſe him, that he has now at length, in another Treatiſe, ſet forth the Particulars of his Charge; that being but (to uſe his own Phraſe) *like Muſtard after Meat.* If he had intended to deal fairly, he ſhould either have brought his Proofs with his Charge, or kept his Charge, till he could *find* his Proofs. But ſo far was he from that, that he expected his Reader ſhould give Judgment againſt me, upon his general Accuſation, without proof (for *Generals*, he ſays, *prove nothing*; Cauſleſs Ground of Surmiſes, p. 2.) Hear how he beſpeaks it. *I appeal*, ſays he, *to all moderate, judicious and impartial Perſons, called Quakers, Whether* T. E. *hath not ſhewed himſelf as a Man hurried and carried away as with a Tempeſt and impetuous Current of prejudice againſt me, not only to heap ſo many Perverſions, Miſrepreſentations, Forgeries and falſe Accuſations againſt me; but*, &c. This is in his *Loving Epiſtle*, before he had brought forth the Inſtances to prove his Charge by. So that the moderate, judicious and impartial Perſons he appealed to, were to take it for granted, upon his *bare* and *general* Accuſation, that I had heaped ſo many

Perverſions, Forgeries, *&c.* againſt him: How elſe could they anſwer his Appeal? By this, Friends, ye may ſee what he meant by moderate, judicious and impartial Perſons, *viz.* Such as would give Judgment upon his Accuſation, *in bare generals*, then, and take his word for proof, till his other Book ſhould come forth. But no ſuch Perſons will he ever find, I hope, among the Quakers. Yet that this was his expectation and deſire, that other paſſage, in the cloſe of his Epiſtle, proves beyond doubting. Where threatning to publiſh his Anſwer to mine (in which he ſaid he had noted Fifty of my Perverſions, *&c.*) he does it with this Reſerve and Proviſo, *If nothing be done forthwith by that Party that hath approved and promoted his Book, to call it in and diſown it.* This plainly ſhews, he expected Friends ſhould have called in and diſowned my Book, upon his *bare* and *general* Accuſation, without ſeeing the Fifty Perverſions, *&c.* he talked of, or hearing what they were. For the calling in, and diſowning my Book, was propoſed by him as an Expedient, to prevent his publiſhing the Proofs of that Accuſation, upon which he would have had it called in and diſowned: But did he herein like a Chriſtian? Like a Wiſe Man? Like a Scholar? Or at all like a Man? Surely, more *diſcretion*, at leaſt, if not *Juſtice*, was expected from *George Keith:* And the truly moderate, judicious and impartial will eaſily ſee, that he hath uſed thoſe Epithets but *artificially*, and to deceive.

He

He is in great Confuſion, in this part of his Work. For he calls his Book *a juſt and neceſſary Defenſe of the Truth, as well as of himſelf*; and yet he is fain to *intreat and requeſt*, over and over, his moderate, judicious and impartial Perſons, and that *earneſtly* too, to *excuſe* him, and not be *offended* with him for it. Surely, if he believed, what he writ was a juſt and neceſſary defenſe of the Truth, he might have truſted it boldly with the moderate, judicious and impartial, without begging their Excuſe, or fearing to offend them.

He goes on thus againſt me, *p.* 3. *But when he cannot heap up ſo many* (Perverſions, &c.) *as he would, he goes about by an Art of wrangling and ſophiſtry of Words, to prove me guilty, when his Evidence in matter of Fact doth utterly fail him*; (of this he gives no Inſtance neither, but ſays I do it) *even as a Man would go before an Aſſize to prove one guilty of Theft or Felony, by falſe Syllogiſms, when his Evidence is ſhort in matter of Fact, thus arguing againſt an innocent Perſon; ſome Man is a Thief, but* A B, *is ſome Man, therefore* A. B. *is a Thief.* Upon this he enters a new Appeal (not ſo reſtrained as before, to the moderate, judicious and impartial; but more at large) *I appeal*, ſays he, *to all that know the Truth* (of which, he knows, there are, *beſides himſelf*, too many that do not walk in it) *whether this ſort of Sophiſtical Arguing, doth Agree to that Simplicity of Truth, and plainneſs both of Doctrine and Practice, that we generally have profeſſed.* This ſhews he is well verſed in the *Fallacies* of Logick, and is ready at making *falſe Syllogiſms*: and it alſo

ſhews

ſhews his unfair dealing. For, Friends, I appeal to you, who not only know the Truth, but dwell and walk in it, whether I have uſed ſuch ſort of Arguing againſt him, as he hath here charged me with? He ſays, *I go about, by an Art of wrangling, and ſophiſtry of words, to prove him guilty, when my Evidence in matter of Fact doth utterly fail me:* And he ſays, *I do this, even as a Man would go before an Aſſize to prove one guilty of Felony, by falſe Syllogiſms, when his Evidence is ſhort in matter of Fact, thus arguing againſt an innocent Perſon, ſome Man is a Thief, but* A. B. *is ſome Man, therefore* A. B. *is a Thief,* Friends, my Book, out of which he pretends to *make* this Charge againſt me, is in your hands; pray ſearch and examine it throughly: ſee if you can find any ſuch falſe Syllogiſm in it, or any ſuch manner of Arguing as he hath here taxed me with. If ye cannot (as I am ſure ye cannot) then pray reflect your thoughts upon *G. Keith*, and conſider ſeriouſly what a ſort of Man he muſt be, to deal thus *Injuriouſly* with both you and me. Hath not he himſelf acted like a Man that ſhould go before an Aſſize, to accuſe an innocent Perſon of ſome heinous Crime, and though he brough *no evidence* to convict him by, ſhould yet preſs to have him condemned, on pretence that he has Evidences *at home*, and will bring them ſometime *hereafter*? Sure I am, ſuch Dealing is very far from the Simplicity, plainneſs and juſtice of Truth, which we profeſs: Yet ſo, ye may ſee, he hath dealt by me in that Epiſtle of his. He ſpeaks of *ſome*, in his Third-*page*, *who*, he ſays,

have

have plucked out their Eyes, and given them away to ſuch as would deceive them. How he ſhould know that ſome have done ſo, unleſs they have brought their Eyes to him to keep for them, I who have kept my Eyes to my ſelf, don't ſee. But queſtionleſs, if he knows any ſuch, that have pluct out their Eyes, and given them away to ſuch as would deceive them, it muſt be to them he made his Appeal *before he brought his Proofs*: for none, he might be ſure, that had Eyes in their heads, and knew how to uſe them, would give Judgment upon his Appeal before they had ſeen his Proofs.

His mentioning how much Friends have been *warned to beware leſt any ſpoil them through Philoſophy and vain Deceit, and impoſe upon them by the Wiſdom of words*, gives me occaſion to ſay, If he had been wary, and not ſuffered himſelf to be ſpoyled through deceit and vain Philoſophy, he would not have ſo far ſhamed himſelf, by impoſing upon others, as he too often does, by words without Wiſdom.

In his Third *p.* he hath a fling at the ſecond days morning Meeting in London, which, ye know, conſiſts moſtly of Miniſtring Friends, with whom he is ſeldom pleaſed. At this time his quarrel with that Meeting is for authorizing or allowing my Book to come out. Yet that he may keep ſteady to his Intention of *Dividing*, he deals with that Meeting, as he did before with the Yearly Meeting, repreſenting this alſo to be what he would have it, divided into Parties. He ſays of my Book, that it came out *Authorized or allowed, either by the ſecond days Meeting*

at

at London, or at least by a Leading or Prevailing Party of them. I mention this, Friends, not that I think there needs any Refutation of it (the *Falsness* thereof being so well known:) but that all may see his *Splitting Design*, and none may give way thereto. In the same *page* he casts a wicked *Scoff* at that Meeting, thus. *And must all this*, says he, *be fathered upon the* Spirit *of God? It being their constant pretension to have the* Spirit *of God Directing and assisting them in all their Chambers Affairs and Meetings.* This needs no Comment neither, Friends, it is enough but to repeat it, ye cannot but savour what Spirit it came from.

The rest of his Third *page*, and so on, almost to the end of his Sheet, he spends in *quibbling* on a Passage in my Book, *p.* 49. where to shew the emptiness of his great Boast, 'That notwithstanding the Objections, and severe Accusations, that some have made against his late 'Books, and a strict Examination of them by 'some that had so complained, there is not any 'Line or Sentence in any of them, that they have 'made to appear to contain any Untruth or Falsehood in them, either in matter of Doctrine or 'Fact; I said 'This has *nothing of Note* in it: For '(supposing it were true in Fact, that no Untruth 'or Falshood in matter of Fact had been discovered in his Books) it was not the proper business of the Yearly Meeting (which here, as 'elsewhere, he strikes at) to judge of the matters 'of Fact contained in his Books, which were 'alledged to have been done in *America*, by 'Persons not here to answer to, or give account 'of them. From the former part of these words

(con-

(contained in the firſt Parentheſis) he would fain ſtrain ſuch a Conceſſion, as might juſtifie all the Matters contained in his Books. He ſays, *p.* 4. I have been *ſo liberal to him, to grant, by way of ſuppoſition,* all thoſe particulars which he there enumerates (comprehending, I think, the ſubſtance of his Scandalous Books written in *America*) *and his Books to contain nothing, yet diſcovered, of Untruth or Falſhood.* This he calls my *liberal Conceſſion*, and is ſo fond of the word, that he repeats it no leſs than *ſeven* times in his fifth page. He knew, I perceive, the need he had of a *Conceſſion*, and a *liberal* one too; but he ſhould not have been ſo *liberal* to himſelf, in making *Conceſſions* from my words, to his own advantage, againſt the plain ſenſe of my words, and of my mind: For, I aſſure him, if I had made him ſuch a *Conceſſion* as he pretends to, it would have been as far from my *intention*, as from his *Deſert*. But let us ſee, whether there be ſuch a *Conceſſion*, or no, in thoſe words of mine. A *Conceſſion* is a *Grant*, and differs much from a *Suppoſition*, whence ariſes that uſual Form of Speech, *Suppoſing, but not Granting* (which is implied even where it is not expreſt.) Now, Friends, if ye obſerve my words in the place before quoted (*p.* 49. of my former Epiſtle) ye will find, I do not ſay *Granting* it to be true in Fact, but *ſuppoſing* it were true in Fact. I was ſo far from Granting it *to be* true in Fact, that I did not ſo much as ſuppoſe it to be true in Fact, but ſaid, ſuppoſing *it were* true in Fact, which implies it was *not true* in Fact, and plainly proves I did not grant it to be true in Fact, no not ſo much as by ſuppoſition. And in the very

next

next Sentence, I affirmed that there is Untruth or Falſhood in his Books, in matter of Fact, and that it was made appear, and wherein. This was far from a *Confeſſion*, Grant, or Allowance, that all the Matters of Fact mentioned in his Books are true. Nay, to prevent any ſuch Miſapprehenſion, I added this Caution, p. 50. *Therefore let none think that becauſe the Yearly Meeting did not declare the Matters of Fact in his Books to be falſe, therefore they are all true. They remain to be proved by him that has affirmed them, and to be anſwered by them who are charged therein.* Ye ſee now Friends, how far I was from *granting* the Matters of Fact in his Books *to be true*, and what little ground he had for his great *glorying* in that which he calls my *liberal Confeſſion*. By which if he *gain* any thing with the *Ignorant*, he will *loſe* more with the *Judicious*, who by this will ſee him to be a *meer Sophiſter*, and conclude his Cauſe to be bad indeed, that hath driven ſo *able a Man* (in his own Opinion, as well as in the Opinion of ſome others) to make uſe of ſo *mean* a ſhift, which a true Scholar would have been aſhamed of.

He charges me alſo with *contradicting* the Yearly Meeting, in ſaying, It was not the proper buſineſs of that Meeting to judge of the Matters of Fact, contained in his Books, *&c.* And he would hence infer, that *the Yearly Meeting both meddled and judged in that which was not their proper buſineſs.* But in this he deals unfairly and weakly, as well as in the former. For ye may ſee, Friends, in the fore-quoted place of my Epiſtle, p. 49, 50. the Matters of Fact I there ſay, it

was

was not the proper buſineſs of the Yearly Meeting to judge, were ſuch as were *alledged to have been done in* America, *by Perſons not here to anſwer to, or give account of them.* For which reaſon that Meeting did forbear to give Judgment in thoſe Matters, though they could not forbear to hear them, being complicated with others, and related or read together. But it doth not thence follow, that that Meeting had not power to judge of thoſe Matters, which were of themſelves, or by his Books, *apparent* to the Meeting, and which did not depend upon the Proofs or Defences of *abſent* Perſons. Such as are the *Breach* and *Diviſion* he has made in *America*, the *ſeparate* Meetings he has ſet up, or cauſed to be ſet up there, (of which his own Books give Proofs ſufficient) the *ſcandalous Books* he has written there, and which have been publiſhed both there, here and elſewhere, to the great diſhonour of God, defamation of our holy Profeſſion, and reproach and grief of Friends.

He would alſo *ſqueeze* ſome advantage to himſelf out of that ſaying of mine in my former Epiſtle, *p.* 72. 'That the way to recover the 'Deceived, is to diſcover, lay open, and witneſs 'againſt the Deceivers. From hence he would fain juſtifie himſelf for publiſhing his abuſive and *ſcandalous Books*. But this will not yield him any defence, unleſs he could prove them Deceivers, whom in thoſe Books he hath written againſt. Which he no otherwiſe here attempts to do, than by begging it from that which he calls my liberal Conceſſion: For thus he ſays, *p.* 7. *By his liberal Conceſſion, ſuppoſing it to be true in matter*

matter of Fact that I have charged upon ſome Preachers in America, *as above-mentioned, they are Deceivers.* But he ſhould have remembred the Rule, *ſuppoſition proves nothing*; and not have built upon a *ſuppoſed Conceſſion*, which hath no Foundation, but in his own Imagination. However, though that Aſſertion of mine, [*That the way to recover the Deceived, is to diſcover, lay open, and witneſs againſt the Deceivers*] will not ſtand him in ſtead: Yet *it is true*, and will ſtand the Truth in ſtead againſt him, and all that turn againſt it. And by it all (that have not pluckt out their Eyes, and given them to him) may ſee, that what he ſuggeſts of the Yearly Meeting and me, that we would have vile and groſs Errors, *&c.* Covered and Cloaked, is a vile and groſs Slander and Calumny of his.

Thus, Friends, I have gone through his Epiſtle, and toucht, I think, the moſt material parts of it. In which, if I would have imitated his Example, I might probably have pick'd up as many *real* Perverſions, Forgeries and falſe Accuſations, out of that one Sheet; as he hath *feigned ones* out of my Epiſtle of near Five Sheets. But I will not imitate his Trifling. I come now to his other Book, called, *A Seaſonable Information, &c.* wherein he pretends to ſet forth Fifty Perverſions, *&c.* which in his former Sheet he ſaid he had noted in my Book, moſt of which are ſo *idle* and *ſilly*, that he has rendred himſelf notably ridiculous in noting them. But before he comes at them, he ſuggeſts, in his Introduction, that I printed that Book *in great diſunity, and againſt*

againſt the mind of many Friends, although approved and promoted by a Party equally prejudiced (he ſays) *againſt him for his faithful Chriſtian Teſtimony to the Truth of Chriſt.* Now Friends, although his Falſhood in this is ſufficiently known to many Friends in *London*; yet becauſe his Books are uſually ſpread (by the help of other Separatiſts) into divers parts of this Kingdom, as well as beyond the Seas, I think fit, for the information of all Friends every where, to let you know how I proceeded therein. After I had written that Book, called, *An Epiſtle to Friends*, I went up to *London* with it, and preſented it to the Second Days Morning Meeting, where ſuch Writings of Friends, as are intended for the Preſs, are to be read and conſidered. I read it throughout in that Meeting: And, to the beſt of my remembrance, there was not one Friend there, (though the Meeting was pretty full) that ſhewed any diſunity therewith, or made any exception againſt it; but the Meeting left me to my freedom, for the publiſhing thereof, which ye may be ſure they would not have done, had they had diſunity therewith. So that I took, (as I conceive) the right way and method, in publiſhing that Epiſtle, and proceeded in the ſame courſe, that all Friends do, who ſtand in unity with the Body of Friends, when they have any thing to Print. And though one Friend (who did not hear it read, nor uſes to be at that Meeting) meeting me caſually in the Street, after it was in the Preſs, would have diſſwaded me from printing it at that time; and, as I have heard, one or two other Friends

(who do not uſe to go to that Meeting neither) when it was well nigh finiſhed, finding what a heat and fret the report of it had put *G. K.* into, did move to have the publication thereof *deferred for a while*, to ſee if they could bring *G. K.* to a better mind: Yet no Friend, either then, or ſince, to this day, hath ſignified to me any diſunity with the Book, or with me for publiſhing it. But if I had gone out of the way of unity, in the publiſhing that Book, was *G. K.* of all Men, fit to charge me with it, who himſelf has not ſet one foot therein, in the publiſhing any of the Pamphlets he hath written, ſince he came into *England*, to ſay nothing here of his other Scandalous Books written in *America?* Hath he offered any of his late Books to the Judgment of that Meeting, to which I brought mine, and other Friends bring theirs, and he (I ſuppoſe) formerly, while he ſtood in Unity with Friends, uſed to bring his? Nay, did he not publiſh his Book, called, The Cauſleſs Ground of Surmiſes, *&c.* not only *not with*, but *againſt the Unity*, and againſt the Judgment even of thoſe Friends, whom he himſelf made choice of *privately* to ſhew it to? But why give I inſtances here of his diſunion with Friends, of whoſe Unity with Friends no inſtance can be given? I proceed to his Fifty Perverſions, *&c.*

The Firſt is, That I *falſly* (he ſays) *accuſe him* (in my Title Page) *of a Spirit of Contention and Diviſion, that* (I ſay) *hath lately appeared in him, and ſome few others that join with him, who have made a Breach and* Separation *from Friends in America.*

America. That a Spirit of Contention and Diviſion hath of late appeared in him, and ſome few others that join with him, is a thing ſo *apparently ſeen*, and known to them that converſe with him, or read his late Contentious Books, that he might, with like modeſty, deny the ſhining of the Sun at Noon in the cleareſt Day. And that he and they have made a *Breach* and *Separation* from Friends in *America*, is ſo fully proved upon him in my laſt, that I am well content to leave it to the Readers Judgment. And whereas he ſays, *Thoſe*, I call *ſome few*, *are about ſixteen Meetings:* I ſay, If that be true (which I queſtion) his Guilt is the greater, in having miſled ſo many.

His Second Charge he takes out of my ninth Page, where he ſays, *I falſly accuſe him, that he blames Friends, that they were gone too much from the Outward to the Inward.* This he ſays, *is a downright Forgery*, and that *he never blamed any for going too much to the inward.* But in this he hath *perverted* my words. For I did not ſay he blamed Friends for going too much to the Inward, but for going too much *from the Outward* to the Inward. The words [*too much*] there related to their going *from the Outward*; which in the following words, I ſhewed, ſaying, *For* G. K's *Complaint and Charge is, That Friends do not preach the* Outward *Appearance and Manifeſtation of Chriſt in the Fleſh enough, or oft enough.* I did not ſay his Complaint was, that they preached the Inward Appearance of Chriſt *too much*; but that they did not preach his *Outward* Appearance

enough, or *oft* enough. And that he did ſo, he himſelf proves in *p.* 10. of his laſt Book, where he ſays, *I have blamed ſome Perſons for not rightly and fully preaching Chriſt Without, &c.* His ſaying in the ſame place, that from my manner of charging him, it plainly appears, as well as from the words of ſome others, that *it was our ſenſe, To preach Chriſt without, and Faith in him, it draws from the inward*, &c. is a *groſs Perverſion* and *falſe Accuſation* in him, as appears from my following words in that ninth page of my former Epiſtle, where I ſay to Friends, 'Ye know this 'Charge of his to be *falſe*, and that the Teſtimo-'ny of Truth hath always been acknowledged and 'born by Friends from the beginning, as occaſi-'on has offered, to the *Outward* Manifeſtation 'and Appearance of Chriſt, as well as to the *In-'ward.*

His Third Charge is, That I *falſly and unjuſtly charge him with* Robert Hannay's *Book, as if it were his, both for Matter and Style*, and that I *caſt it upon him.* For this he cunningly quotes my 15*th.* page, where I ſay leaſt of it; (for there I only ſaid, 'Conſidering the manner of that 'Pamphlet's coming forth, the *Matter* and *Style* 'thereof, and his refuſing to diſown it, I ſhall 'leave it (my Friends) to your impartial Judg-'ment, whether the *Reflections* contained in that 'Pamphlet againſt the Yearly Meeting, are not 'juſtly to be charged upon him.) But in my 11*th.* and 12*th.* pages, ſpeaking of it, I ſaid, 'How far *G. K.* had *an hand*, or was *concerned*, 'in the Writing of that Book, I will not here ſay.

'But

'But I may ſay, the matter of the Queries in that 'Book, is ſo much the ſame with the matter of 'the other Book publiſht ſoon after with *G. K*'s 'Name to it, and the Style thereof ſo agreeable 'to his Style, in that and his other Writings, 'that whoever ſhall take him for the Author of it, 'will, I think, be very *excuſable*, though he 'ſhould prove in part miſtaken. And a little after, 'But in as much as they are *both of a Party*, 'and *R. Hanway* is at *G. K*'s right Hand in his 'Work of Contention and Diviſion, and *G. K.* '(though often put upon it) hath not publickly 'diſowned that Pamphlet, which *R. H*'s Name is 'to, I do not think I ſhall wrong *G. K.* (as in-'deed I would not) in ſuppoſing him to have at 'leaſt a ſhare therein, *&c.* This was not directly charging him with it, nor caſting it upon him. Yet I declare, I am more ſtrongly now perſwaded that he had the greateſt hand in it, than I was before. For mark but what he now ſays, *p.* 10. *As I had no hand in the Printing it, but was againſt it; ſo diverſe things in it, that ſeemed to ſome moſt offenſive, I was not concerned in.* He does not ſay he had *no hand* in the *Writing* it; but he had no hand in the *Printing* it (that is, he did not actually work at the Preſs;) but was againſt it, he ſays; That proves he was *privy* to the Printing, how elſe could he be againſt it? Next he ſays, he was not concern'd in *divers* things in it; does not that imply he was concerned in the *main*? And laſtly, the divers things he ſays he was not concerned in, were thoſe that ſeemed moſt offenſive to *ſome*, he does not ſay they ſeem'd moſt offenſive to *him*. See now, whether

he has any whit mended the matter, in clearing himſelf of being a Party (at leaſt) to that Book, and conſequently guilty of that *Inſincerity*, which in my laſt I charged upon him.

His Fourth Charge is, That I *not only falſly accuſe him, but am guilty of an abſolute Forgery and Fiction in matter of Fact, That he refuſed to go out at the Yearly Meeting in* Philadelphia, *held in the Seventh Month*, 1691, *and that his refuſal to go out was the occaſion of their delay to give Judgment againſt* W. Stockdale, *for which, as a proof, I cite his Book*, called, Some Reaſons and Cauſes, *&c. p.* 14. In this I acknowledge a *miſtake* on my part; not in ſaying, he refuſed to go out at the Yearly Meeting in *Philadelphia*, (for that I underſtand he did:) But my miſtake was, in referring to a place in his Book for Proof of this, when as that place, it ſeems, related not to that Yearly Meeting, but to a Quarterly Meeting. In which miſtake, I think I am the more excuſable, being led into it by his *obſcure way* of Writing. For neither in that 14*th.* page of his ſaid Book, called, *Some Reaſons, &c.* (formerly quoted by me,) Nor in the 18*th.* page of the ſame (now quoted by himſelf) is there any Day, Month, or Year ſet, wherein either the Quarterly or Yearly Meeting was held. And whereas he quotes his 18*th.* page to prove he did go out at the Yearly Meeting; there is a *Fallacy* in that: For there being (as he notes) *Six* Meetings in that time of the Yearly Meeting, he did go out at ſome or *one* of them, but *refuſed to go out* at the reſt. But he is too eager, in calling this a Forgery,

gery, an abſolute Forgery and Fiction, a groſs Forgery, (ſo he endeavours to aggravate it) and that too in *matter of Fact*. For the *matter of Fact* is, that *he did refuſe to go out of the* Meeting, wherein his Charge and Proofs againſt *W. Stockdale* were to be conſidered of, though he was by the Meeting deſired to withdraw. Whether that Meeting was Yearly, or Quarterly, and on what Day, or in what Month it was held, or where, are but Circumſtances of Time and Place. The *matter of Fact*, *viz.* That he did refuſe to go out, at the Meeting's deſire, *is true*, and proved by his own Confeſſion, not only in the place before quoted by me (though miſapplied there as to the particular Meeting) but even in this laſt Book alſo, *p.* 11. where he acknowledges his refuſal to go out, and gives the ſame reaſon for it, as he gave before in his former. But to make him amends for my former miſtake, I will now put him in mind, that not at that Quarterly Meeting only, but at *another* Meeting alſo, where, it ſeems, his Complaint was depending, he refuſed to go forth, though deſired by the Meeting, and that by his own Confeſſion, in his Book called, *Some Reaſons, &c.* p. 18. to which he has now referr'd me, and thereby helped me to this additional Proof againſt him. There he brings it in with a Note thus; *Note, That whereas it hath been ſaid by ſome, That they would have dealt with theſe men, who have been guilty of thoſe Errors, but that* G. K. *would not go forth, being deſired to withdraw at the* Meeting *at* R. E's, *and at the Quarterly* Meeting. *To which his Anſwer is, That* G. K. *had good reaſon*

not to withdraw at Both *theſe times.* This, I hope, proves the *matter of Fact*, in both points, both that he refuſed to withdraw, though deſired, and that at two ſeveral Meetings, while his Charge and Proofs were to have been conſidered of; and that his ſo refuſing did delay or hinder the Meeting from dealing (as they otherwiſe would have done) with thoſe he had accuſed. And thus his Charge of *Forgery*, abſolute *Forgery*, groſs *Forgery*, double *Forgery*, with which he hath made ſuch a vaunting Flouriſh, falls to the Ground. And I might, (if I had his Forehead) recharge him with Forgery, in ſaying, I charged him with refuſing to go out at the Yearly Meeting in *Philadelphia*, held in the Seventh Month 1691. which laſt words, relating to the time of it, are not in my Book. But I need no ſuch *little Tricks*, though he doth.

His Fifth Charge he takes out of *p.* 22. of mine, where I inferr'd from the Judgment given by the Yearly Meeting againſt *W. S.* 'That that Meeting was not at a ſtand (as *G. K.* abuſively repreſents them) to determine whether the Doctrine was true or falſe; But, if they were at a ſtand at all, it was to determine whether the Charge exhibited by *G. K.* againſt *W. S.* was true or falſe; *W. S.* both then (and to his dying day) denying that he ſpake thoſe words, which *G. K.* charged him with. This he ſays, *I falſly alledge*, and that *he has fully proved the contrary*, urging for his Proof, that *in the Judgment that Meeting gave, they grant*, That Proof was made by Two *Witneſſes*, *that the Charge exhibited*

was

was true; and if they had been at a ſtand on that Point, it is not like that they would have given any Judgment againſt him at all. This is no Proof at all, that they were not at a ſtand and did demur whether the Charge exhibited were true or no. For though they might have great reaſon to doubt the Truth of the Evidence of thoſe two witneſſes, who were both known to be *ſtrong in Party* with G. *K.* and *great adverſaries* to W. S. and might thence have juſt cauſe to *ſuſpend* their Judgment for a while, and take the *longer time* to examine, ſift and try the matter to the utmoſt: Yet unleſs *W.* S. could have *diſproved* that Evidence, the Meeting could not well do other than give Judgment according to the Evidence, though they might not have compleat ſatisfaction of the Veracity of the Witneſſes. For even in worldly Courts (where Juſtice is to be exceeded by the Diſciples of Chriſt) Judgment is to be given (*Secundum Allegata & Probata*) according to what is alledged and proved; and often is ſo, where yet the truth of the Evidence is *much doubted*, and ſometimes wholy disbelived by the Court that gives it. Here then his hold fails him.

Ye may remember, Friends, that in my former Epiſtle, *p.* 20, *&c.* to manifeſt that *G. K.* quarrelled with that Yearly Meeting at *Philadelphia*, and publiſhed his Anathema's againſt them without juſt cauſe, I ſhewed from his own Books, 'That that Meeting, did not only receive his Charge againſt *W. S.* but did give a determination therein, a Judgment againſt *W. S.*

W. S. Under this I perceive *G. K.* lies *very uneasy*, and would fain cast it *off*, that he might have some colourable pretence for his disorderly *casting off* that Meeting. First, he cavils at them for *not publishing their Judgment till nine Months after*. How to understand that, I cannot well tell: for if, as he says, that Yearly Meeting was held in the Seventh Month, 1691. it was not 9. Months to the adjourned monthly Meeting in the Twelth Month 1691. nor full Six neither: And yet it should seem to have been published *before that*, because in the Judgment of that Meeting, this Judgment of the Yearly Meeting was in part recited. Next, he finds fault with the Excuse he says they make for not publishing it sooner, which was that *they were prevented by reason of his unruly Behaviour, and extream Passion*. This he calls *a most deceitful pretence*. What other Causes of delay they might have in publishing their Judgment, I know not; but that this was one, I am the more easily induced to believe, from what I my self observed of his *Unruly behaviour, and extream Passion* in our late Yearly Meeting at *London*, of which, Friends, many of you were *grieved Witnesses*, as well as I. He asks, in the next place, *why they contradicted the sound Judgment of a Monthly Meeting at* Philadelphia, *passing due Censure upon W. S. Six Months thereafter*? Methinks this doth not sound, as if it came from *a sound Judgment*. Is it proper to say, that he or they that give a Judgment *now*, do contradict that Judgment that shall or may be given by others *Six Months* hence. If they gave their Judgment at that

that Yearly Meeting, near Six Months *before* the other Judgment (if that was another) was given, how then can the firſt be ſaid to contradict the latter, when the latter was *not in being* when the Firſt was given. One would think if there be Contradiction in the two Judgments, the latter ſhould rather contradict the former. But to ſpeak plain my ſenſe of them, according to what I have ſeen of them both, in his Books, I do not find that either of them contradicts the other; but that the *latter* Judgment (to wit that of the adjourned Meeting) reciting, at leaſt in part, the *former* Judgment of the Yearly Meeting, doth (for ought I ſee) approve it, and carry it on further. Yet he ſays, of that Judgment of the Yearly Meeting, *it is Sufficiently apparent from this* (*viz.* its contradicting, I think he means, the Judgment of the adjourned Meeting, which had no being till about Six Months after) *it was no cordial, nor Sincere Judgment.* But let me ask him, if this was not a ſincere Judgment, but, as he alſo calls it, *Hypocritical*, how came it to paſs that his adjourned Meeting, which he celebrates for giving *ſound* Judgment, and ſays they gave it *Sincerely*, not only recited part of this Judgment, but *built theirs upon it*? For thus in his *Reaſons of the Separation p.* 11. he has delivered their Judgment to us. 'Whereas *W.*—— having formerly accuſed 'G. K. with preaching two Chriſts, and the 'Charge and matter having been fully debated 'at the laſt Yearly Meeting, before publick 'Friends, and others, who did deliver it as their 'Senſe and Judgment, that the ſaid W.—— had

'abuſed

'abuſed *G. K.* thereby, and that *G. K*'s. Doctrine 'was right and true in his preaching Faith in Chriſt 'within, and Faith in Chriſt without, *&c.* See here the *Baſis* upon which they build their Judgment. Would they build their Judgment upon an inſincere, hypocritical Judgment, methinks it ſhould not become *G. K.* to faſten ſuch a foul *Blemiſh* upon his adjourned Meeting, which he *Praiſes* ſo highly for giving *ſound* Judgment, and that *ſincerely*. Another Objection he makes againſt that Yearly Meeting, that *they did not all that time intervening, bring* W. S. *to any Conviction, but mightily ſupported him as an innocent Perſon.* Can any one believe this, *viz.* that they mightily ſupported him as an innocent Perſon, who at the ſame time ſhall read in *G. K*'s own Books, that *they delivered it as their Senſe and Judgment, that he had abuſed* G. K. *and that he was reproveable and blame-worthy*, &c? But as for *G. K*'s. ſaying, They did not bring *W. S.* to *any Conviction* (which he very often repeats) I know not well what to make of it. I know he underſtands Words well enough, when he is *cool:* Which makes me queſtion whether his *Heat* has not tranſported him beyond his underſtanding. If he means that they did not bring him to an *inward* Senſe, and Conviction in himſelf, that he had done or ſaid Evil, they cannot be juſtly blamed for that, ſince that is not in the power of Man to do, and if *W. S.* knew himſelf *innocent* (as, it ſeems, to the laſt, he affirm'd he was) it was not poſſible they could bring him to *ſuch* a Conviction; nor do I find, the *ſound* Judgment, as *G. K.* calls it, of the adjourned Meeting (how *ſincerely* ſoever given) wrought

wrought *that* Effect on him, any more than the Judgment of the Yearly Meeting had done. But if he means by *Conviction*, (according to the *uſual* acceptation of the Word, eſpecially in Judicial Proceedings,) a proving him guilty by the Evidence of Witneſſes, it is to be hoped, they brought him to *ſome ſort* of Conviction that way, before they gave Sentence of Condemnation upon him; nay, it appears by *G. K*'s own Book they did. Yet *G. K.* ſays, they did not bring him to *any* Conviction. *G. K.* will needs have it, that the determination given by the Yearly Meeting againſt *W. S.* was *not ſincere:* Yet becauſe he cannot make it out, he firſt *begs the Queſtion*, and then offers a *precarious* Proof. Thus he doth it, in anſwer to my ſaying, A Determination then, it ſeems, was given, by his own acknowledgment. *I anſwer*, ſays he, *ſeeing it was not ſincere, but hypocritical* (there he *begs* the Queſtion:) *as appears*, ſays he, *by their contradicting the Judgment of the* Monthly Meeting *that gave it ſincerely and duly.* (There's his *precarious* Proof.) But firſt, how does it appear that the Yearly Meeting, (about Six Months before the Monthly Meeting, as he calls it, gave any Judgment at all) *contradicted* the Judgment which that Meeting gave near Six Months after? Secondly, how does it appear that his Monthly Meeting gave their Judgment *ſincerely* and duly? Why, **Ipſe dixit**, he has affirm'd it; and they that will believe it may: But the beſt on't is, they that will not believe it, upon his bare word, may chuſe, and I know not how he will help himſelf. But is it not ſtrange, that ſo ſtrong a Man

Man ſhould argue ſo *weakly?* He repeats alſo, the Yearly Meeting's publiſhing their Judgment *Nine Months after*, and he thereupon calls it *an Abortive, out of due time.* But I doubt the *Women*, that read that, will *ſmile* at him, for calling *a Birth of Nine Months, an Abortive.* He objects alſo, *p.* 12. that *when they publiſhed it, they did not own the words ſpoken to be any offence againſt God, or Chriſt, but to ſound and tender Friends.* But if this was ſo great an offence in the Yearly Meeting, what will he ſay for his Adjourned Meeting, who in their Judgment, as he has given it, do not *own* (to uſe his own word, I ſhould elſe have ſaid *declare*) the words ſpoken by *W. S.* to be any offence againſt God, or Chriſt, or to ſound or tender Friends either: So that they went *not ſo far* in expreſſing the offence, as the Yearly Meeting did, and yet he calls theirs a *ſound* Judgment, and given *ſincerely.* But where is the *ſoundneſs* of his Judgment, and his *ſincerity* the mean while?

His Sixth Charge againſt me is thus worded. *He falſly and moſt fictitiouſly alledgeth, That* Tho. Fitzwater *ſufficiently proved his Charge againſt me, for which he refers to my own Books; but this is a great Forgery, for his Charge was, That I denied the ſufficiency of the Light, and this his Four Credible Witneſſes did not prove againſt me, but it was quite another thing that the Monthly Meeting of the other ſide alledgeth, they proved againſt me,* viz. *That I did not believe the Light was ſufficient without ſomething elſe.* Where's the *great Forgery* here? If there be any, it will lye at his Door, for reporting

porting me to have alledged that *T. Fitzwater* ſufficiently proved his Charge, *&c.* whereas my words are, *It ſeems T. F.* ſufficiently proved the words he charged *G. K.* with ſpeaking, and ſo I think it *will ſeem* to any one that conſiders the words *charged*, and the words *proved*. The words *charged* were, *That he denied the ſufficiency of the Light:* The words *proved* were, that *he did not believe the Light was ſufficient without ſomething elſe:* And theſe laſt words, he ſays, is *quite another thing* than the former; ſo that according to him, not ſufficient without ſomething elſe, is *quite another thing* than, not ſufficient. But I think it will be hard for him to make that ſufficiently out. Nor doth the aſſerting the ſufficiency of the Light, *exclude* (as he would fallaciouſly infer) *the Man Chriſt without us*: For the Man Chriſt without us, in his glorified ſtate, in which he is united with the Godhead, is Light. And though *G. K.* to compaſs his Deſign, doth *cunningly* ſlide in the word *within*; yet he knows it was not in the words *charged*, nor in the words *proved*: The Charge was, That *he denied the ſufficiency of the Light.* The Proof was, that *he did not believe the Light was ſufficient without ſomething elſe.* Here was the Light mentioned *indefinitely*; not a word of *within*: And therefore he does not fairly, nor like a Diſputant, to thruſt it in afterwards. His charging me with excluding the Man Chriſt without us, is an abuſe; and his telling me of *Jeffery Bullock*, an idle Bugbear. *He has clear'd me himſelf*, beyond what he is able to aſperſe me with, by Citing thoſe Paſſages out of a former Book of mine, called

called, *The Foundation of Tythes ſhaken*, p. 238. where, in anſwer to my Opponent, a Prieſt, that had in Print affirmed, 'That ſome Quakers '(ſlighting the Merit and Neceſſity of Chriſt's 'Death) aſcribe Salvation to the following the 'Light within; I rejected his Charge, and in the 'Name of the Quakers denied it; putting him 'to Name thoſe Quakers, and ſolemnly decla-'ring I knew no ſuch. Then added, 'Nor do 'the Quakers aſcribe Salvation to the following 'the Light within, but they aſcribe Salvation to 'Chriſt Jeſus, to whom the Light within doth 'lead thoſe that truly follow it. And in *p.* 240. I ſaid, 'If any one expects Remiſſion of Sins by 'any other way than the Death of Chriſt, he 'renders the Death of Chriſt uſeleſs. Theſe Paſſages *G. K.* hath now Cited, in his *Seaſonable Information*, p. 12. and that *with approbation*, (ſave only that he would have the word *Only* added to the *Light within*; which, to gratifie him, I am content to do, thereby expreſſing what was before implied:) And as this was my Judgment and Teſtimony *then*; ſo it is *now*: Which ſufficiently clears me from his ſlande-rous Suggeſtion, that I exclude the Man Chriſt without us, from having any part or concern in our Salvation. And truly, Friends, by his thus dealing with me, I have a great gueſs at his way of dealing with Friends in *America*, and after what manner he has gathered up the groſs and vile Errors, and Damnable Hereſies, and Do-ctrines of Devils he ſo liberally charges them with; and ſo I hope will ye too, upon the read-ing of this.

I hope

I hope, Friends, I have clear'd this Point to your Satisfaction, and made it appear, by what the Yearly Meeting did in hearing *G. K*'s. Complaint and Charge against *W. S.* and in giving Judgment, according to Evidence, in the Case both of *W. S.* and *T. C. George Keith* had no just Cause or Ground to Anathematize that Meeting, and Write and Print against it, in that reproachful manner he has done, to the dishonour of Truth, and Scandal of his Profession, the Guilt of which lyes upon him, and will lye on him till he repent thereof.

In his Seventh Charge he says, *I falsly allege, that he accounts the beginning of the Separation at* Philadelphia, *from some's going away at the Monthly Meeting, the Day before the Adjourned Meeting; and upon this Foundation of Forgery* (so he calls it) *I build*, he says, *a false superstructure; for though* (says he) *some going away from that Monthly Meeting, was a preparation to the Separation, yet I did not reckon that the beginning of it, but their going away at the Adjourned Meeting the next Day following; where* (he says) *three great Instances of their beginning the Separation, appeared.* First, *Their disowning the Meeting.* Secondly, *Upon that Foundation, their going away.* Thirdly, *Their denying the Judgment of that Meeting to be a true Meeting, and refusing to suffer it to be recorded.* In this he has dealt *unfairly* with me. For he charges me with saying, That he accounts the beginning of the Separation at *Philadelphia*, from some's going away at the Monthly Meeting, the Day before the Adjourned Meeting; and *there he stops* (as if I had made him to account *that only*, the beginning

ning of the Separation), and then he calls this a Foundation of Forgery. Whereas I joined *that*, and the Quarterly Meeting's denying the Adjourned Meeting to be a right Monthly Meeting, together, saying thus, (as ye may see in p. 23. (not 25. as he quotes it) of my Epistle;) 'I 'remember indeed, he alledged (in that Yearly 'Meeting at *London*) That at a Monthly Meet-'ing in *Philadelphia*, *T. Lloyd* went away, and 'took away a Skirt, or Wing (as he called it) 'of the Meeting with him; and that that Meet-'ing afterwards Adjourning it self to another 'Time and Place, was denyed by the Quarterly 'Meeting to be a right Monthly Meeting; and 'this (said I there) he would have taken for the 'beginning of the Separation. *This*; not only somes going away from the Monthly Meeting before the Adjournment, but the denying the Adjourned Meeting to be a right Monthly Meeting: And he himself gives that now (as he did the other also, in his relation of it at the Yearly Meeting, though he now disowns it) among his three great Instances of their beginning the Separation, *viz.* Their disowning the Meeting, their denying the Judgment of that Meeting, and refusing to suffer it to be Recorded. (Poor for his saying, Their denying the Judgment of that Meeting to be a true Meeting, I have not Judgment enough to make common sense of it: For I understand not how the Judgment of a Meeting can be said to be a Meeting.) He says, *But, that the Meeting could not Adjourn, because the Book and the Clark was gone, is so ridiculous, that 'tis not worth mentioning; though that's the chief, or rather the only Reason given by* T. E. Shall I call this a *Forgery*, or a *Per-*

a *Presumption*. I am sure 'tis a *foul one*, which soever it be. For I *no where said*, The Meeting could not adjourn, because the Book and the Clark was gone. *I no where gave* that as the *only*, or as *any* Reason, why the Meeting could not adjourn. But I urged the Clark's being gone with the Meeting Book, before the adjournment was made, (and that not in an abrupt manner, or by way of Breach or Disunion, which I argued from his not being reproved, or blamed for it afterwards by the Meeting) as an Argument that the Meeting was really *ended* before that Adjournment was made, and that consequently that Adjournment was *irregular*, and without Authority. Friends, this is *a main point*: For upon that Adjournment depends much of the open Breach that followed. Therefore this had need be well heeded. In my former Epistle, I handled this Point pretty largely, because I knew there lay *much weight* upon it. *G. K.* in his Answer has well nigh *waved* it all, at least the *most pressing* parts of it: Which shews his *Weakness*. I shall therefore run over again here, some part of what I said on this Subject before, that it may appear how *short* his Answer is, and that his strength lies more in a sort of *Sophistical* Arguing, and *quibbling* on words, than in substantial and solid Reasoning.

I urged in my former Epistle, *p. 26.* the Clark's going away with the Meeting Book, (as well as some others of the Meeting) as an Argument that the Meeting was regularly ended before the Adjournment was made. *To this he gives no Answer.* But *fallaciously* slips from this

to another thing; crying out, *Is it ridiculous to ſay that the Meeting could not adjourn becauſe the Book and the Clark was gone*, and that this is the chief, or rather only Reaſon given by me. I have ſhewed this to be falſe. But what's this to the purpoſe? The Queſtion is not whether the Meeting could adjourn while it was a Meeting: But whether it was a Meeting, when the Adjournment was made? Or whether it was not ended and broken up before. I obſerved that *G. K.* himſelf ſpake of it doubtfully and with reſerve. He did not ſay the Meeting was *not* broke up before the Adjournment: but that it was *not underſtood* to be broke up before the Adjournment. *He ſays nothing to clear this.* Part of the Meeting he ſays was gone. What made them go, before the Meeting was ended? The Reaſon he gave is, *its being cold Weather, and growing dark.* But among thoſe that went away the Clark of the Meeting it ſeems was one, and he took the Meeting's Book with him. If *ſome few* would take the liberty to riſe and go away before the Meeting was ended, becauſe it was cold and grew dark, is it reaſonable to think that that would have induced the Clark of the Meeting to have gone away too and carried the Meeting's Book away with him in which the Proceedings of the Meeting ſhould be recorded, before the Meeting was ended? Or have excuſed him if he had? Would any Meeting ſuffer that in a Clark, *without Reproof*? Believe it that can. And let *G. K.* clear himſelf fairly of this, if he can. Till then, I ſhall take it for certain, that that *Monthly Meeting*

was ended and broken up, part of the Friends *gone away*, the Clark *gone*, the Book in which the Proceedings of the Meeting ſhould be recorded *gone*, before the Adjournment was made, and conſequently *that Adjournment not good*; but invalid. And if ſo, then neither thoſe Friends that denied the Meeting, held next day at the School-houſe upon that Adjournment, to be a right Monthly Meeting; nor the Quarterly Meeting, which afterwards refuſed to record in their book the Acts of that Meeting, held on that Adjournment, did thereby begin the Separation, or give the others any juſt cauſe to ſeparate. Divers other Paſſages in the 26, and 27. pages of my former Epiſtle, tending to prove, that not Friends, but *G. K.* and his Party begun the Seperation, he takes *no notice* of; but carps at a word, to wind himſelf off by, that he might get clear of this matter. I had ſaid before, 'Truly the time, manner and Circumſtances 'of that Adjournment conſidered, it ſeems to 'me that this was an irregular Meeting, ſurreptitiouſly obtained, to ſerve a private end. This he makes his Eight Charge, thus.

He falſly alledgeth that the Meeting Adjourned, was ſurreptitiouſly obtained, which he grounds on a Forgery or Fiction of his own deviſing, as if Twenty Nine of them might be looſe or raw Perſons. Is it a Forgery or Fiction to ſay they *might be* looſe or raw Perſons? I did not ſay *they were*; and I gave the Reaſons that induced me to think they *might be ſuch*, which I had *from himſelf*. For when I had ſaid, 'It ſeems to me, this was an ir-

'irregular Meeting, ſurreptitiouſly obtained, to 'ſerve a private end; I added, 'and the rather 'for that I obſerve, when he ſets forth (to 'grace it) the Number of them that met upon 'that Adjournment, conſiſting of (he ſays) at 'leaſt Sixty Perſons, he adds (which as much 'diſgraces it) *Moſt* of which uſed to keep 'Monthly Meetings. So that Twenty Nine of 'thoſe Sixty might be raw or looſe Perſons, 'brought in to do a Job, or ſerve a Turn. And 'that they were ſo, I am the more induced to 'think, from his giving the Names of ſome 'of them, but not of them all. This makes it plain, that I did not ground my ſay-ing, on a Forgery or Fiction of my own con-ſing; but upon the Account himſelf had given of the Perſons, *viz.* That being in number Sixty, *moſt of them* uſed to keep Monthly Meetings, which might be true, though Twenty Nine of the Sixty were raw or looſe Perſons. But ſince that Adjourned Meeting was deſigned for ſuch an extraordinary ſervice, as to give forth three Judgments (which it ſeems they did) why ſhould *ſome* be brought to help make up that Meeting, who did *not uſe* to keep Monthly Meetings be-fore; unleſs it were *to ſerve a Turn?* And why ſhould he undertake to give a Liſt of the Names of ſome of them, and not of them *all*, but that he too well knew there were too many raw or looſe Perſons among them?

But from my uſing the Words, *Surreptitiouſly obtained*, he takes occaſion to *ſlip aſide* again from the matter, and ſays, *I may much more juſtly ſay, his ſcandalous Book is ſurreptitiouſly come out in print, being*

being contrary to the mind of many Friends, and to Gospel Order, professed by himself, and all professed Friends, viz. That none expose another in print, or print against another, till he be disowned by the Meeting to whom he belongs, after a fair Tryal had. Whether my Book came out surreptitiously, I leave to you, Friends, to judge, from the Account I have herein given before, of the manner of its coming forth. And as to his complaint of want of Gospel Order, I desire you to consider, that before my Book was written, *he had refused to hear the Church*, not only in *America* (where he was openly and judicially denied) but here also, in not following the advice and counsel thereof. And truly I think, the Church would be in but an ill condition, if one, under pretence and protection of Membership, might be imboldned to *throw dirt* upon her, and another of her Members might not have the liberty to endeavour at least *to wipe it off*. But since he urges that Order, *That none expose another in print, or print against another, till he be disowned by the Meeting to whom he belongs*, &c. let me ask him, *Why he has exposed me in print, or printed against me*, who am not disowned by the Meeting to which I belong? And what Gospel Order hath he given to either the Yearly Meeting, or the Second Day's Morning Meeting, before he exposed them in Print? He says, *It has not been in the least intimated to him, that any Meeting in* London, *where he now lives, hath denied him.* By this it seems as if he expected to be *as oft* denied as he removes his seat. What if a Meeting in *London* had denied him, and he should thereupon

remove to *Briſtol*, and from thence to *York*? Would not his having been denied in *London* ſerve his Turn, unleſs he were in like manner denied again in each of the other Places alſo? But what need was there that any Meeting in *London* ſhould intimate to him their denyal of him, who hath *cut off himſelf* from Friends, by open Separation, and denied both the Yearly and Second Day's Morning Meeting in *London*? Beſides he hath ſet up his Standard, Proclaimed War, begun it in *America*, transferr'd it hither, and, is eagerly carrying it on here; And he knows the ſaying, *Inter arma ſilent leges*. Can he reaſonably expect the exactneſs of Proceeding by Goſpel Order againſt him, when he hath made open War againſt Friends without Goſpel Order? He ſays, *But I printed nothing againſt any in* America, *till Goſpel Order was given there, and was rejected by them.* I do not believe this to be true: He has expoſed in Print *a great number* of Friends by name in *America*: Yet I don't remember to have read in his Book, that any of them were complained of to the Meetings to which they belonged, but *W. S.* and *T. P.* Therefore I have reaſon to think they were not. Let him ſhew what Goſpel Order all they ſeverally had, whoſe names he has expoſed in Print.

His Ninth Charge is not only a meer *Cavil*, but I take it to be done with deſign, as well as the former, thereby to *diſjoyn* the Account of the Separation, which I had *connected*, that he may *confound* his Reader. He grounds this Cavil upon an *hint* I gave (and that but in a Parentheſis)

renthesis) that ſpeaking of a Monthly Meeting in the Firſt Month laſt, he ſet no Year either when that was, or when his Book was Printed, as there is ſcarce to any of his late Printed things, which renders him and his works more obſcure. *This* he ſays, *I falſly alledge, and that the contrary is to be ſeen in his Book*, quoting *p.* 19. (of his Reaſons and Cauſes, *&c.*) But the mention he made of the Monthly Meeting in the Firſt Month laſt, was not in p. 19. but in p. 15. of that Book. So that I muſt have *hunted* from p. 15, to 19. if I would have ſought it; And yet I ſhould *not have found it* there neither: For indeed it is *not there*, nor any where elſe in his Book, that I can find. He ſays, *He ſhews in that Nineteenth page, that the Monthly Meeting that gave Judgment againſt* W. S. *and* T. F. *was the Twenty Seventh of the Twelfth Month*. 1691. And in that he ſays true. He adds, *And it plainly appears from my Book, that the Monthly Meeting in the Firſt Month laſt* (there mentioned) *was in the next Month following, in the Year* 1692. And in that he ſays *Falſe*; no ſuch thing appearing plainly, or at all. Now he refers from p. 19. to p. 27. *where*, he ſays, *that very Year is mentioned*. And ſo indeed it is, but not as relating to the Meeting in the Firſt Month laſt, but as the date of a Letter, Written the 15th. of the Third Month, 1692. without any mention of the Meeting in the Firſt Month laſt. That Firſt Month *laſt* muſt be the Firſt Month *next before* the Book, in which it is mentioned, was Printed. For the date of the Book therefore I ſearched, both in the Title page, and at the End: But it doth

not

not appear by the Book it self, either in what Year, at what Place, or by whom it was Printed. I gave but a *transient hint* before, of his obscure way of Writing, not intending to insist on it. But since he takes that *light Correction so impatiently*, it's fit, I think he should have *more*, since *more is due* to him. Therefore, I now add, That his Book called, *The Plea of the Innocent*, &c. His Book called, *Truth and Innocency defended*, &c. His Book called, *A Testimony against that false and absurd Opinion*, &c. His loving Epistle, (as it came out at first, distinct from his Seasonable Information, to which it is now stitched) none of these have the Year, when, the Place where, or the name of the Printer by whom they were Printed, as other Mens Books usually have. By this it appears, that it was not without cause I gave him that *gentle Rub* before, (which he had better have born, than have given Occasion for *severer Rubs* to follow,) but that he had no cause to charge me with dealing *falsly* by him in it. Why he should *choose* (for, in so many instances, it looks more like *Choice*, than *Chance*) to conceal the dates of his Books, I cannot tell; unless it were, that from the *Uncertainty* that arises from such an *obscure* way of Writing, he might haply *catch* his Answerer upon *some mistake* in point of time, (as he did me about the Yearly Meeting) and thence both take the advantage to insult over him, and withal *avoid* his Argument.

In his Tenth Charge, He Vaunts himself over my Ignorance, saying, *I most perversly and Ignorantly alledge* (by a *sort of Argument that is so silly and weak, that scarce an Ordinary School-Boy*

Boy would use it, suppose him to mean One of his own inſtructing) That if that Act of T. L's. (*viz.* ſays *G. K.* his withdrawing from the Monthly Meeting adjourned where I begin it: But ſay I, his withdrawing from the Monthly Meeting before that adjournment, where *G. K.* did formerly begin it) *was the Cauſe of the Separation, that it ſhould not be the Separation it ſelf: But the Separation muſt come after this, as the Effect follows the Cauſe.* This (that the *Effect follows the Cauſe*) he ridiculouſly calls Nonſenſe. And thereupon reminds me of the advice he gave me in the Yearly Meeting, to beware of *falling into the Ditch of that called Philoſophy.* If that called Philoſophy be a *Ditch*, Friends, I have no mind to fall into it. For if it be a *Ditch*, I doubt it is a deep one, becauſe he who has walked ſo long by it, keeps ſo much Dirt from his Pen.

[illegible] (it is [illegible] even of an Enemy) I am content to learn of another, ſhall be aware, and not venture too far into his Ditch, leſt he bring an Action of *Invaſion* againſt me, for entring, againſt his mind, upon his Poſſeſſion, the Ditch of that called Philoſophy. Yet let him give me leave to put him in mind (for I doubt not but he knows it already) that *Omnis Cauſa eſt prior ſuo effectu* (every Cauſe is before it's Effect) and *Effectus non eſt Cauſa* (the Effect is not the Cauſe) are *true* Rules in that Philoſophy, which is *not a Ditch*. But, Friends, (whatever his Logicians or Schools-men, as he ſays, teach; who are *not always* in the right, as he is *often* in the wrong) when I argued, that if that Act of *T. Lloyd*'s going

going out of the Monthly Meeting, and taking away a Wing or Skirt of the Meeting with him (which *G. K.* said he did) was the Cause of the Separation, then it could not be the Separation it self: But the Separation must come after this, as the Effect follows the Cause. I suppose I spake to your Understanding, and that ye will not be easily perswaded by his Logicians, or Schoolmen, or himself either to put the Cart before the Horse, or the Effect before the Cause. But however *Ignorant* I was, what *Forgery*, *Perversion*, or *false Accusation* was there in this?

His Eleventh Charge, is, That I *falsly alledge, that the Change of the Meeting in* Philadelphia *from the Bank to the Centre, was in Course. This*, says, he, *I prove to be false and a Fiction, because, as the time of the Course of it was not yet come, nor did come either so soon before or after, so That... put it to a vote, by giving a sign, whether it should be removed or not, &c.* This Proof of his consists in two things. First, That the time of the Course of it (that is of its being removed in Course) was not yet come.

This Objection I remember he made in the Yearly Meeting at *London*, and it was there Answered, and I took notice of both the Objection and Answer in my former Epistle, p. 21. thus, 'I remember indeed (which I would here note) '*G. K.* did object, That *the Meeting was removed* 'that Year somewhat earlier, than it had been some 'other Years. But to that it was replied, by 'the Friends of *Pensilvania* then present, that 'there was no *certain* day prefix'd and settled 'for the removing thereof; but it was either 'earlier or later in the Year, according as the 'Seasons

'Seaſons of the Year proved fair or foul for 'weather. This *plain* and *full* Anſwer to his Objection *G. K.* takes *no notice of*; but urges afreſh, that the time of the Courſe of changing the Meeting was not yet come, as a Proof that my ſaying it was changed in Courſe is Falſe and a Fiction. But this ſtands ſtill in his way, and he muſt remove this, before he can get forward. He muſt prove that there was a *prefixt* day for the removing of the Meeting, and that Friends removed it before that fixt day was come, e're his Proof will ſtand him in any ſtead. However, Friends, I hope ye will take notice, that by his ſaying, The time of the Courſe of it was not yet come, nor did come either ſo ſoon before or after, he grants *the Meeting had a Courſe of Removing*, and that both before and after. See now how unfair he was, to charge Friends there with aſſuming a Power to change the Meetings, when the Meetings were, by his own acknowledgment, *to be changed in Courſe*. And judge whether the Friends removing the Meeting from one Houſe to the other, as it uſed in *Courſe* to be, either was an Act of Separation in them, or could be a juſt ground to *G. K.* and his Party, to ſeparate from them. The other part of his Proof, that my ſaying the Meeting was changed in Courſe is Falſe, and a Fiction, is, that *T. L.* put it to the vote, by giving a ſign, whether it ſhould be removed or not. But this is ſo far from being a Proof, that it ſelf wants a Proof, and may be falſe and a Fiction, for ought appears: For he gives it but upon the credit of his own word.

In

In my 32, and 33. pages, I ſhewed, that not the Friends, in removing the Meeting *of Courſe*; but he and his, in keeping a Meeting at the Bank *out of Courſe*, when the Meeting was *in Courſe* removed, made and began the Separation. It had concerned him to have Anſwered this, and cleared himſelf of it (and ſo no doubt he would if he could) but he takes *no notice* of it; but ſlips away to where I mentioned, *Thomas Wilſon*'s Evidence, and charges me with perverting *T. W*'s. words.

This is his Twelfth Charge. Now *T. W*'s. Evidence was, that, having asked *G. K. What end he thought the Friends had in removing that Meeting*, G. K. *ſaid, he believed they did it to force him to Meet with them*. This ſays *G. K. proveth that they that uſed that force towards me, were guilty of the Separation*. But how proves he that any did uſe force, or intended to uſe force towards him? The Friends did not ſay ſo; *T. Wilſon* did not ſay ſo: 'Twas only *he himſelf* ſaid *he believed* they did it to force him to Meet with them. But his believing ſo (if he did really believe ſo) does not prove it was ſo. But if he did believe ſo, he was (as I obſerved in my former) the more to be blamed, in urging the removing of that Meeting as an Inſtance, or Proof, that the Friends began the Separation. For to ſeparate themſelves from him, and to force him to Meet with them, are *contrary enough*. But where's his Proof that I have perverted *Tho. Wilſon*'s Words, which he himſelf takes as I laid them down, without contradicting them; yea and

and argues from them, though perversly and falsely?

His Thirteenth Charge he calls, My *Perversion, in Charging him for having a Private Family Meeting at his House*, &c. Upon this he runs out, as far as to the Act of Parliament that allows five besides the Family to meet. And infers, that *by my Sentiments, Men must not instruct their Families, nor pray in their Families, without authority and appointment of the Men's Meeting, or if they do, they must let none other be present.* All this is but empty noise raised artificially to amuse his Reader. He gave the occasion for my taking notice of his Family Meeting, by having proposed the quite *laying aside* the Afternoons Meeting, that Friends had always held, and *setting up* private Family Meetings in the room of it. And because that Proposition did not take, (the Friends would not loose their Meeting for) he thereupon, when the Meeting was removed from the Bank to the Centre, *set up* an Evening Meeting in his Family, which being done in a Spirit of contention, opposition and division, was the same in nature and ground with his other open separate Meetings. This he seemed to be sensible of himself, and therefore to obviate the Objection that he saw might be made, he said in his Reasons of the Separation, p. 15. *That could be counted no Separate Meeting for that day.* This led me to say, 'As he gives 'no Account by *whose appointment*, or *what Au-* 'thority that Meeting was held: So he offers 'no reason why it could not be accounted a

'Separate

Separate Meeting; nor do I think, indeed, that he can give any. For though Men may inſtruct their Families, and pray in their Families (being rightly moved thereunto) yet a private Meeting in a Family, ſet up in *Oppoſition* to publick Meetings, and in *Diſunion* to Friends, is as really a Separate Meeting, as the openly Separate Meetings are.

He ſays, *My Clamour about their Meeting at the* Barbadoes-*Houſe, is idle and impertinent.* So he is willing to turn off any thing that he cannot anſwer. But it's ſo pertinent, that it faſtens the Separation upon him and his Party ſo cloſe, that he cannot ſhake it off. He ſays, *We met not there till they had ſeparated themſelves from us, and denied the Monthly Meeting.* This is but a *begging* of the Queſtion, in both parts of it; which he were not *hard beſet*, ſuch a Man as he would not have done. That the Friends, in removing the Meeting from the Bank to the Centre, did ſeparate themſelves from him and his Party, is denied. That the Meeting which the Friends denied, and whoſe Acts the Quarterly Meeting refuſed to Record, was a rightly conſtituted Monthly Meeting, is denied. Theſe are main Points, which he ought to have *proved*: But not being able to do that, he *begs* them; too meanly for him. But what can a Man do, though his Abilities be *great*, when his Cauſe is *not good*? He adds, *Beſides that, they not only threatned to keep us out at the Bank Meeting, but moſt rudely abuſed us when we met in it, always interrupting any of us that ſpoke, though we never interrupted them.* I perceive by this he cannot ſay they were kept

out

out at the Bank Meeting: The higheſt he goes, is, that they were threatned to be kept out; and for the Truth of that, we have but his word. But it is a known Truth (which I ſuppoſe himſelf is not ignorant of) that Friends in *England* have been actually kept out of their Meeting-houſes by thoſe Separatiſts, whom he is now fallen in with. As for what he ſays of being rudely abuſed, they muſt be *rudely abuſive* indeed, that could exceed him that way. He adds, *And at laſt ſending ſome, by their Magiſtratical Authority, with Saws and Axes to knock down our Gallery, but they were prevented by ſome that knocked down both the one and the other, which* (ſays he) *I had no hand in, directly nor indirectly,* (could he not have ſaid, *but only looked on, and laughed for Joy?*) where he mentions *Our Gallery*; ſo that it ſeems, when he met in the ſame Room with Friends, he had a ſort of ſeparate Meeting even there, and a *ſeparate Gallery* for himſelf and ſome of his Party, *in oppoſition* to the Gallery the Miniſtring Friends uſed to ſit in. He ſhould have done well to have told how that Gallery of his came to be ſet up, and when. This brings to mind ſomething I have read at the Yearly Meeting, concerning this Gallery-work; and to the beſt of my remembrance it was to this Purpoſe, That after *G. K.* had broken out into *open Oppoſition* in Friends Meetings, and a little before he went *quite off* from them, being uneaſie in ſitting in the ſame Gallery with Friends, his Followers ſet up a new Gallery for him, on the other ſide the Room, over againſt the old Gallery; and this was done privately and ſuddenly. But

when it was known, and known to be done without the Consent of the Meeting, or of those particular Friends who were the Trustees for the Meeting-house, two of the Trustees went in a peaceable manner, to take it down again: Who that they might proceed therein by joint-consent, called *Robert Turner*, (who also was one of the Trustees) to go with them. But when they came into the Meeting-house, *R. Turner*, instead of taking down the New Gallery, striking only a transient stroke upon that, went to the old Gallery of Friends, and fell with that fury upon that, that having gotten suitable assistance, they cut and tore down the Posts, Rails, Seats, and Bottom of it, laying it level with the Floor of the Meeting-house, and looking upon it, shewing his great satisfaction and joy, by saying at it. This is that *R. Turner*, who was the man in Signing the Judgment given at the Quarterly Meeting in Lancaster on behalf of G. F. But that the Trustees who went to take down that New Gallery, were sent (as G. F. affirms) by Magistratical Authority, doth not appear.

That which he calls my Fourteenth Perversion, is, *That he claimed a Power to alter, change, and set up Meetings as he pleased.* This he calls both a *Perversion* and *Forgery* (for he is very liberal of those Terms) and he says, *The Foundation of it is by my own Confession, because he declared his sense, by way of Proposition, That it were good to have but one publick Meeting on First Days, and the remaining part to be used in private Families.* (He should have said for private Meetings

Meetings in Families; for to be said before; and that was it he would have been at.) *Now, Reader*, (says he) *have what Ground he had from my simple Christian Proposition, to invent this Forgery.* Nay, say Reader, and before thou judgest, let me shew thee, if thou hast not already seen it, what Grounds I had, and gave in my former Epistle, for charging him that he and his Party would have assumed a Power to alter, change, appoint, pull down, set up Meetings as they pleased. First, I shew'd, p. 35: *That they would have pulled down the publick Afternoons Meeting, and had it quite aside*; next, That *they would have set up private Meetings in Families, instead thereof.* Thirdly, *Their setting up a new Afternoons Meeting of their own heads.* And whereas in this his declaring *his sense, that it were good to have but one publick Meeting on First Days, &c. was his Act of Imposition*; and, to palliate the matter, *his simple Christian Proposition*, I say it went beyond a Proposition. He declared not only his *Sense*, but his *Intention*. *Some of us*, says he, (speaking of his Friends of the Separation) *did declare our Intention and Sense*; as much as to say, It is our *Sense*, that it were good to have but one publick Meeting on First Days, and *we intend* to have but one. It is our *Sense* that the remaining part of the Day should be used for private Meetings in Families; and *we intend* to do so. This is confirmed by their Practice, which was pursuant to this their *Intention*. For as it was their declared *Intention* and Sense, (for I think their Intention went before their Sense) that it were good to have but one publick Meet-

ing on First Days: So, when they found that Friends would not let fall their Afternoons Meeting, he and his Party stuck to their own *Intention*, and withdrew from it, keeping but one publick Meeting on that Day. As they had declared their *Intention* and Sense, that the remaining part of the Day should be used for private Meetings in Families: So when Friends would not change their publick for his private Family-meetings, he and his Party stuck to their own *Intention*, and held a private Family-meeting in his House. (*Some of us met*, says he, *at a private Family-meeting in the Evening, at the House of* G. K. *p.* 15.) And after all this, when he saw that private Family-meetings would not do; he with his Party, *assumed a Power* to set up, and did set up, a new publick Afternoons Meeting. (*Their keeping up*, says he, *their publick Afternoons Meeting, hath given us just occasion as well as they to have a publick Afternoons Meeting, as well as they*, p. 16.) Now Reader, judge and declare not, whether I had not good Ground to say he and his Party would have assumed a Power, to alter, chop, change, appoint, pull down, set up Meetings, as they pleased; and whether he had any just Cause from thence, to charge me with Perversion and Forgery.

His Fifteenth Instance of my perverting his Words, that *because he said, It was good to have but one publick Meeting on First Days, I* (he says) *thereby inferr'd that it was not good, according to his Sense, but evil, to have two publick Meetings on First Days, and that therefore to keep two was against his*

his Conſcience. I did not ſay againſt his *Conſcience*, but againſt his declared *Intention* and *Senſe*. What that was I know: But what his Conſcience is I don't know. But be it what it will, I think I made appear that in his ſetting up his Afternoons Meeting, in oppoſition to the Ancient Meeting of Friends, and *contrary to his before-declared Intention and Senſe*, he went not upon a ſincere, godly, conſcientious Ground, reſpecting the Honour of God, the Propagation of Truth, the Edification and Benefit of the Church: But a Political, Popular, worldly Ground, reſpecting his own Reputation and Honour, that he, and they with him, might not be thought leſs Zealous, than the Friends they had ſeparated from, *&c.* which was fairly deduced from the reaſon he gave for his ſetting up that Meeting, *viz. Their keeping up their publick Afternoons Meeting, hath given us juſt occaſion at preſent to have a publick Afternoons Meeting as well as they, for we hope they ſhall not have cauſe to ſay againſt us, that we are ſhort of them in our Zeal for good Meetings* Thus, in the 37th. page of my Epiſtle, I quoted out of his Reaſons of the Separation, *p.* 16. and argued largely on it; which he has not anſwered: As indeed he ſeldom does any thing that is Argumentative; but catches at words, and quibbles on them. Thus what I offered in *p.* 38. to ſhew, from his ſaying, That *the Separation was well warranted both by Scripture-Teſtimony and Command of Chriſt, &c.* 'That he took the Separation upon himſelf, becauſe it would be (as I 'there argued) an apparent Self-condemnation 'in him to ſay, the Friends had ſeparated from

'him, and that their so separating was well-war-
'ranted by Scripture and Command of Christ.
This, I say, he skips lightly over, and catches
at another Quotation I gave out of him, where-
in he charges me with Perversion and Forgery,
but without cause.

This he assigns for my Sixteenth Perversion, saying, That *in labouring to cast the Separation on him, by writing some of his words, I leave out a material Clause in the Sentence that clears him*; the whole Sentence being this, *Now the Scriptures that warrant us in this Separation, (altho', as is said, first made by them) are these following*, &c. *The words* [*altho', as is said, first made by them*] *which* (he says) *clear him fully, that he did not take the Separation on him*, he says, *I fraudulently leave out*. But in this he deals *fraudulently* with me, and with his Reader. For the Inference I made from those words of his, *viz.* [*the Scriptures that warrant us in this Separation*] was not so much designed to prove he *began* the Separation, as that *he is in it*. I had proved just before, from his saying, [*This Separation was well-warranted*, &c.] that he *began it*, or took it upon himself. And by his after words, I shew'd that *he was in it*. The Scriptures that warrant us (says he) in this Separation. There I stopt with an *&c.* to shew that was not all the Sentence. Then making my Inference thus, *This is a sufficient Warrant sure to lay the Separation at his Door; for here is a plain acknowledgment that he is in it*, I added (to have prevented this Cavil) *tho' he idly pretends that others began it*. And this, I think

think will ſhew that he idly charges this as a Perverſion and Forgery on me.

In his Seventeenth, he quibbles on the words *Separate* and *Separation*, only to amuze and puzzle his Reader. I had quoted another paſſage of his, to ſhew he had taken (though perhaps, unwittingly) the Separation upon him. It was this; *We are convinced and perſwaded in our Conſciences, that God calleth us to ſeparate from ſuch unbelievers*, (ſo he branded Friends there.) Hereupon I ſaid, 'This ſure is a full proof, not only 'that they are in the Separation, but that they 'began it: For if the Friends (whom he calls 'unbelievers) had firſt ſeparated from them, 'then how could he ſay God called them to 'ſeparate from the unbelievers, when the un'believers (in his ſenſe) had ſeparated from 'them before. And carrying on my Argument, I ſaid, 'A Separation from a Thing or Perſon, 'implies a being joyned to that Thing or Per'ſon before, and till ſuch ſeparation be made. *G. K.* Paſſing by my Arguments, catches hold on the word *Separate*; and plays upon it, and putting ſome cavilling Queſtions about it (not very difficult, but very impertinent, to be anſwered) cries out *I have ſhewed my great Ignorance* (which is a ſort of *art* he uſes, to *huff* his Opponent, and *damp* him, if he can) and at laſt, his great Knowledge brings the matter to this Iſſue, that *the Word Separate hath ſeveral ſignifications*. What then? Hath it not the ſignification I uſed it in, (*viz.* an Implication that the things or Perſons ſeparated were firſt joyned)

Will he deny that the Word Separation implies a being joyned before? Nay: He grants it in the preſent Caſe; ſaying, *It being granted that we were formerly joyned with them, this doth not prove*, &c. So that what has all his *quibbling* upon the word *Separate*, come to, but to ſhew a *Diſpoſition to Cavilling*, and thereby to *evade* an Argument.

He ſays, *It being granted that we were formerly joined with them, this doth not prove that we begun the Separation.* No ſure! for this is ſufficiently proved by other mediums. But what *Trifling* is it in him ſo to argue? *But after it was made by them*, ſays he, *we were warranted and juſtified by the Scripture*, &c. *to remain ſeparate from them.* This is pitiful ſhuffling, by which he would wind himſelf off, from having taken the Sepation upon himſelf, when he ſaid, *This Separation is well warranted*, &c. *The Scriptures that warrant us in it*, &c. *We are convinced and perſwaded in our Conſciences, that God calleth us to ſeparate*, &c. But it will not help him. For to ſeparate (in that ſenſe eſpecially, which is proper to this Subject) is *to withdraw from.* So a Separatiſt, in the common acceptation of the word, is one that hath *withdrawn himſelf* from the Society, Communion, or Fellowſhip of Others, whom he was joyned with before. But *G. K.* has found out a *new* way of Separation, and a *new notion* of the Word, whereby he would make them the Separatiſts that are withdrawn from, not them that withdrew. Had I argued thus, he would have paid me off, with his fine Terms of groſs Ignorance, ridiculous Folly, and the like, which he

he liberally bestows. But it is evident he is forwarder to Cavil and Rail, than to Answer an Argument: For after all his noise about the Word [Separate,] he leaves my Arguments unanswered, p. 39. and 40. whereby I proved from his own Words, that he began the Separation. And seeing he would over-look them before, I'le set them before him again. From his having said (in his Reasons of the Separation, p. 22.) *We are convinced and perswaded in our Consciences, that God calleth us to separate from such Unbelievers.*

I argue thus. 'If the Friends (whom he calls 'Unbelievers) had first Separated from them, 'then how could he say God had called them to 'Separate from the Unbelievers, when the Un'believers (in his Sense) had Separated from 'them before. A Separation (said I, and I say it 'again) from a thing or Person, implies a being 'joyned to that thing or Person before, and till 'such Separation be made. But if the Friends 'there, had begun the Separation before, then 'they had thereby disjoyned themselves from '*G. K.* and his Party; and *G. K.* and his Party 'could not have afterwards Separated from them; 'because they were not then joyned to them; 'consequently it could not be, that God should 'call them to Separate from the others, if the 'others had Separated themselves from them be'fore. If therefore they are convinced and per'swaded in their Consciences (as *G. K.* says they 'are) that God called them to Separate from 'these whom he calls unbeleivers, and that they 'answered that Call, they must then acknowledge

'that

'that they began the Separation. And that 'they did so, his following words shew, p. 23. 'Where he says, *We have great clearness and peace 'in the Lord, to retire and Separate from such dis- 'orderly Walkers and talkers, as we have formerly 'done from other Professions.* Here (said I) it 'appears the Friends kept their standing, stood 'their Ground; and *G. K.* and his Party retired, drew back, or withdrew, and Separated 'themselves; and that purposely with design to 'to Separate. For he adds (a little after) *Yet 'we design not any Separation from our faithful 'Brethren here, or elsewhere.* A Separation then, 'it seems, they did design, though not from such 'as they account their faithful Brethren, &c. Thus in my former. And can he be so shallow, to think he answers all this by saying, *After the Separation was made by them, we were warranted and justified by the Scripture without, and the Spirit of Truth within, to remain Separate from them*? Doth this answer his own terms, wherein he expresst himself before, when he said, *We are convinced and perswaded in our Consciences, that God calleth us to separate* (an Active Voice) *from such unbelievers*; when he said, *We have great clearness and peace in the Lord* (what to do? to remain? No.) *to retire and Separate from such*, &c. And how? *As we have formerly done from other Professions.* How was that?) Did other Professions first Separate from them, and they remain in their old Meeting Places, which those other Professions had left, forsaken, retired, withdrawn from? Or did they Separate from other Professions, and leave, forsake, *retire*, withdraw

draw from their Society, Fellowſhip and Meeting-Places. Mark this well, Friends; If G. K. and his Party did really Separate from other Profeſſions, then he and they did really Separate from Friends in *America*, whom he calls unbelievers, and diſorderly Walkers and Talkers: For he ſays, *We have great clearneſs and peace in the Lord, to retire and Separate from ſuch diſorderly Walkers and Talkers, as we have formerly done from other Profeſſions.* This is not Trifling, but Solid Reaſoning. Therefore let him not ſhuffle and dodge, after ſuch an Unmanly manner; but diſpute fairly, and acquit himſelf, if he can.

His Eighteenth Charge againſt me is, that *I deny it hath been proved that his Oppoſers in* Penſilvania, *are guilty of vile Errors; and that I alledge, He put the words he Charges them with, from their own diſcourſes*, &c. This he calls a Forgery, for want of an *harder* Term. But he perverts my Words, which were theſe; 'In the tracing this 'matter (the Separation) through *G. K*'s. 'Book, I obſerve he makes a great *Noiſe* and *Out-'cry* of groſs and vile Errors held by ſome, and 'them upheld by others, which he gives for one 'Reaſon or Cauſe of the Separation. But in as 'much as this is only his Charge without due 'proof, and the Perſons, by him Charged with 'thoſe vile Errors, are not here preſent, to make 'Anſwer to his Charge, and defend themſelves, or 'to ſhew the Occaſions that led to, and Circum-'ſtances that attended thoſe Diſcourſes, from 'which he pick'd the words he charges them 'with,

'with, and to explain their meanings therein, 'I have not thought it fit, or becoming me, on 'no better ground, to meddle with those mat-'ters, being alike unwilling to justifie them, if 'in any thing they have done or said amiss, as 'to condemn them unheard, upon the report of 'another, and him their professed Adversary. Here I joyned together his *twofold* Outcry, that gross and vile Errors were held by some, and that they that held them were upheld by others, (which was the third and main Reason he assigned for the Separation; and I said that this was without due Proof. This he says, *is a Forgery*, and that *it is apparent from the Testimonies of those whom I pretend greatly to credit.* The First he offers is, *That Judgment* (which he says was) *given out from the Meeting of Ministring Friends, as 'tis called, the fourth of the fourth Month:* (in some Year: or other, I suppose; but he tells us not here in what;) That Judgment (he says) doth declare, *that Proof was made by two Witnesses, that* W. S. *should say, That* George Keith's *Preaching Christ without, and Christ within, was Preaching two Christs.*

To this I say, This is no *due* Proof, that *W. S.* was guilty of holding that vile Error *G. K.* charges him with, That to Preach *Faith in Christ without, and Faith in Christ within,* is to Preach *two Christs.* For the Terms are different. And although to Preach *Faith in Christ* without, and *Faith in Christ* within, is not to Preach two Christs: Yet *G. K.* might so Preach Christ without, and Christ within, that it might seem like a Preaching of two Christs, for ought appears to

to the Contrary. And indeed, although *G. K.* brought two Witneſſes to atteſt that *W. S.* did ſay (as *G. K.* here reports it) that *G. K*'s. Preaching Chriſt without, and Chriſt within, was Preaching two Chriſts; yet the credit of their Teſtimony is juſtly queſtionable, both as they were chief Men in *G. K*'s. Party, and as *G. K.* himſelf doth *vary* in his Charge againſt *W. S.* from their Teſtimony. For their Evidence (as he reports it from the Judgment of the Meeting) was expreſly, *That* W. S. *ſhould ſay, That* G. K's. *Preaching Chriſt without, and Chriſt within, was Preaching two Chriſts.* But *G. K.* himſelf charges him with ſaying, *Chriſt within and Chriſt without are two Chriſts*, p. 3. And afterwards, in the ſame page, he alters the Charge again, alledging he ſaid, *To Preach Faith in Chriſt within, and Faith in Chriſt without, was to Preach two Chriſts*, Plea of Innocent, Page 3. ſo again he reports it in Page 22. And in Page 23. he asks, *Why do not the words of their Judgment run thus, That* W. S. *did ſay, To Preach Faith in Chriſt without, and in Chriſt within, was to Preach two Chriſts?* So that he would have had the words of their Judgment, to have run otherwiſe than the Words of his Witneſſes Evidence did run; by which they that run may read how little regard he himſelf had to his own Witneſſes Evidence. And although that Meeting, proceeding upon that Evidence (ſuch as it was) did blame *W. S.* for uttering thoſe words, which thoſe Witneſſes did witneſs againſt him: Yet it is plain that *W. S.* was *not guilty* of holding that Error *G. K.* charges him with, That *to Preach Chriſt without, and*

and Christ within, was to Preach two Christs, seeing he always denied that he spake those words; whereas if he had been guilty of such an Error in his Judgment, it may reasonably be supposed he would have owned the words charged upon him, and have laboured to *maintain* and defend *his Error*, that being the Common way of the Erroneous. But, if *W. S.* had been really guilty of holding such an Error, yet certainly that Man must be made up of Errors that can believe, the Judgment of that Meeting which condemned him for speaking (as the Witnesses attested) those words which are charged upon him as his Error, to be a due proof that that Meeting upheld him in that Error. And therefore hitherto it is no Forgery, nor fault, in me to say, *G. K's.* great *Outcry* of gross and vile Errors, held by some, and then upheld by others, *has not been duly proved.* His Second Instance, that he hath proved his Charge (*viz.* That some are guilty of holding gross and vile Errors, *&c.* And others of upholding them therein) is, That *he stands Recorded* (as he says,) *on the Monthly* Meeting *Book at* Philadelphia, *by the Monthly Meetings Judgment given out against him, and clearing* T. Fitzwater, *the Twenty sixth of the third Month,* (in what Year?) *For accusing him that he denied the sufficiency of the Light; and the Evidence against him was, that he said he did not believe the Light was sufficient without something else; whereby* (says he) *it is evident, they exclude Christ's manhood, Death and Sufferings, Blood and Intercession for them in Heaven; from having any part in our Salvation.* This is far from being a Proof, either that that *T. F.* did exclude Christ's

Christ's Manhood, Death and Sufferings, Blood and Intercession for us in Heaven, from having any part in our Salvation, or that the Meeting there upheld him in it. For it is but *G. K's.* own Inference, and that unfairly drawn. *T. F.* it seems, charged *G. K.* with denying the sufficiency of the Light. *G. K.* put him to prove it. He proved by four Credible Witnesses, that *G. K.* said, *He did not believe the Light was sufficient, without something else.* What *G. K.* meant by that something else, I do not find was *then* explained or discoursed. *Afterwards*, it seems, *G. K.* alledged, that by that something else, he meant Christ's Manhood, Sufferings, Death, Blood, Resurrection, Ascension, Intercession, *&c.* Did the Meeting condemn *G. K.* for this? I find no such thing. But because they did not at his Instigation, condemn *T. F.* for accusing *G. K.* falsly, in saying he denied the sufficiency of the Light (which he proved against him by four Witnesses,) therefore he flies out against both *T. F.* and the Meeting, charging them with excluding the Man Christ Jesus, his Sufferings, Death, *&c.* from having any part in our Salvation; which was no Doctrine nor Tenet of theirs, but a false Inference of his own, and is as forcible against himself, as it can be against them. For in his Reasons of the Separation, p. 8. he says, *divers were present at the place and time where and when W—— alledged he heard* G. K. *deny the sufficiency of the Light*, &c. *that cleared him, that they heard him both then and at all occasions, that he delivered his mind on that subject, always bear Testimony to the Sufficiency of the Light to Salvation.*

Here

Here ye ſee, he makes his own Witneſſes ſpeak as fully and expreſly of his Teſtimony to the ſufficiency of the Light to Salvation, as *T. F.* or any other could do, and that *without any expreſs reſerve* for ſomething elſe. So that if *T. F's.* charging him with denying the ſufficiency of the Light, ſimply and without Explication, doth exclude the Man Chriſt Jeſus, his Sufferings, Death, *&c.* from having any part in our Salvation: *G. K's.* aſſerting the ſufficiency of the Light to Salvation, ſimply and without explication, (as in the place before quoted he does) doth the ſame. And therefore *G. K.* is the more to be blamed, for caſting ſo *foul a ſlander* upon others, which from his own words might with little Reaſon be caſt upon himſelf. But, Friends, ye know we never did nor do, oppoſe the *Inward* Appearance of Chriſt in Man, to that *Outward* Appearance of him in that prepared Body, wherein he obtained Redemption for Man; nor by aſſerting the ſufficiency of the Light, do we exclude, or intend to exclude the Man Chriſt Jeſus, his Sufferings, Death, Blood-ſhedding, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, Interceſſion, nor any thing that he wrought on Earth for us, or now, by his Mediation with his Father, worketh for us in Heaven, from having a part our Salvation; And *G. K.* hath not yet proved that any in our ſociety hath ſo done. His third Inſtance he gives to prove that he has proved his Charge (*viz.* That ſome are guilty of holding groſs and vile Errors, *&c.* and others of upholding them therein) is, The Paper, called, A true Account of the Proceedings, *&c.* at the Yearly Meeting at *Lond.* the

the ſecond Month, 1694. *which*, he ſays, *doth plainly declare, that ſome were guilty of Erroneous Doctrines, or unſound Expreſſions*, their words being theſe following; *And although it appears that ſome few Perſons have given Offence, either through Erroneous Doctrines, unſound Expreſſions, or Weakneſs, Forwardneſs, want of Wiſdom, and right Underſtanding*, &c. This doth not declare what he ſays it doth plainly declare, Namely, that ſome *were guilty* of Erroneous or Unſound Expreſſions: For it appears ſome few Perſons have given offence, *either* through Erroneous Doctrine, unſound Expreſſions, *or* Weakneſs, Forwardneſs, want of Wiſdom, and right Underſtanding. So that, what Offence was given, might as well be through Weakneſs, forwardneſs, want of Wiſdom, and right Underſtanding, as through Erroneous Doctrines or unſound Expreſſions. Nay, if it were through unſound Expreſſions (though they are not to be excuſed, yet) that doth not prove a Man guilty of *holding groſs and vile Errors*, &c. For a Man that is *ſound in Judgment*, and Doctrine, may *chance to drop* an unſound Expreſſion, through weakneſs, as ſome perhaps in *America*, through *G. K*'s. catching Queſtions, may have been drawn to do, whoſe *weakneſs* for him to expoſe in Print, in that aggravating manner as he has done, to the reproach of the whole Profeſſion, is very great *Wickedneſs* in him, and for which *his Condemnation* from God *ſlumbers not*. His laſt Inſtance is, that *He produced above ſix Manuſcripts*, (What means he by *above ſix?* Does he mean ſix and a half? For if they had been Seven

or Eight, he might as well have ſaid ſo, as above ſix;) *ſigned with the Perſons own hands, that were read at the Yearly Meeting, that proved them ſufficiently guilty of vile Errors, &c.* He being a *Party* is not a competent *Judge*, what is *ſufficient* Proof in this Caſe. That ſome *Manuſcripts* were read in the Yearly Meeting by him, or on his Part, I remember; how many they were, or whether ſigned by the Perſons own hands, I know not. But, ſuppoſing (not granting) thoſe *Manuſcripts* to be either *Autographs*, or *Authentick* Copies, I believe he himſelf would think much, to be concluded and condemned from *Inferences*, or *Conſtructions* made upon *Manuſcripts* (eſpecially if they be private Letters, as I think ſome of thoſe he had read, were) without his being preſent, and having the liberty to *open* and *explain* his *ſenſe* and *meaning* in any Paſſage, Word, or ſentence in them. Having gone through his Proofs, (which, I think, I have ſhewed amount to no Proof) he *threatens*, *if I or any others perſiſt to charge him, that he has wrongfully charged them in* Penſilvania, *theſe* Manuſcripts *then read, with ſome others, may be made publick for his further clearing.* For my part, I am of Opinion, that his publiſhing thoſe Manuſcripts, he threatens us with, will be ſo far from clearing him, that it will make his *guilt* appear the more clearly; and I am perſwaded that is the chief (if not only) Reaſon, why he has not publiſhed them all this while.

His

His Nineteenth taxes me *with Fallacy and Deceit, in covering* W. Southbe, *by concealing those Words in his Letter, where he confesseth, that he called it doubtful Questions, whether the Patriarchs have received the Resurrection?* This is a very *Idle Cavil*; yet serves to shew what sort of Questions he used to put, to draw some simple plain Friends to drop such Expressions as he might *pick* some advantage out of against them: And this may be one, of many Instances that might be given, *of his picking words from their Discourses*, to Charge them with; which, in his last Head, he Charged me with *Forgery*, for but mentioning. But if *W. Southbe*, did account that a doubtful Question, is that any more than he himself does? What means he, when (enumerating many Doctrines, which he says we hold in common with other Professions, *Causeless Ground, p.* 4.) he says, *The deceased Saints have not yet* (generally) *received the Resurrection of the Body*, &c. Why *generally*, if he did not either think some had, or doubt whether they had or no? Must *W. Southbe* be Unchristianed, rendred guilty of holding gross and vile Errors, Damnable Heresies and Doctrines of Devils; for only calling it a *doubtful* Question, whether the Patriarchs have received the Resurrection; and that by him, who seems himself to doubt it, either of them, or some other deceased Saints? For his saying, the deceased Saints have not yet (*generally*) received the Resurrection, implies, he thinks some have. But that *W. Southbe* does believe a general Day of Judgment, and the Resurrection of the Dead at that Day, I shewed before from

his own Letter, where having ſet forth *G. K*'s Charge againſt him, that he denied any general Day of Judgment, and the Reſurrection of the Dead; but only what every one Witneſſeth within here, he Solemnly *denies the Charge*, calls that Doctrine *Damnable* and Athieſtical, declares that *he believes the Reſurrection according to the Scriptures*, and the Antient Doctrine of Friends concerning it; which was enough, one would think, to ſatisfy a wiſe Man (one eſpecially that pretended to be of the ſame Communion:) and *Paul* himſelf could not ſatisfy the *Fool* about the Reſurrection. *G. K.* ſays, *T. E.*'s *Fallacy is the more manifeſt, that in* W. Southbe's *Confeſſion of Faith, recited by him, there is not one word concerning the reſurrection of the Dead, nor of Chriſt's coming without us, to Judge the Quick and the Dead*, &c. As to the Reſurrection he had ſpoken largely of it, in the ſame Letter, before, which I ſuppoſe to be the reaſon, why he did not repeat it expreſſy by that Name after: Yet in that Declaration of his Faith, having mentioned Chriſt's Aſcenſion into Heaven, and his Sitting at the Right hand of the Majeſty on High, he adds, *And that every one muſt appear before his Judgment-Seat, to receive their Reward, according to their Deeds done in this Mortal Body, even at that great and dreadful Day of a general Account*, &c. G. K. quarrels further with *W. Southbe* for ſaying he doth not own the day of Judgment now, in or after the ſame manner, as he did when he was a Papiſt; for then he owned it *very Carnally* and outward, *viz. That the great Judgment ſhould be in an outward valley called the*

the valley of Jehoſaphat, in the Land of Iſrael, and and that we ſhould ſee with theſe outward Eyes; But (ſays he) I believe now it will be *more Spiritual*. This doth not pleaſe G. K. who catching hold of his words, that *when a Papiſt, he owned it very carnally and outward*, he would ſlily ſuggeſt from thence, as if his Belief of it was worſe now, than when he was a Papiſt. Perhaps indeed, his Belief of it when a Papiſt might beſt fit G. K's. notion of it, who (I have heard) did jump in with the Papiſts, in pitching upon the Valley of Jehoſaphat for the Place, till a Traveller telling him that Place was too Streight, he took wing from the *Valley* into the *Air*. But I ſee no cauſe G. K. hath to condemn *W. Southbe*, for beliveing it will be *more Spiritual* than the Papiſt hold; nor to infer from thence, that it will *not be outward*, ſince doubtleſs it may be *more* Spiritual than the Papiſts hold, and yet be *outward alſo*. But I had beſt have a care how I meddle too far in this matter, leſt G. K. put me into *Inquiſition* alſo, and bring me upon *Examination* again, which if he ſhould, I am like enough to anſwer him, that I believe in this, as in other Divine things, *according to the holy Scriptures*; and that I doubt would anger him afreſh.

For he makes it the Ground of his Twentieth Perverſion, that I clear *T. L. A. C. S. I.* and *I. D.* by Printing part of a Paper, Subſcribed by them, on behalf of themſelves, and many others, and directed to him and others, wherein they ſay, 'As to Unity in Doctrine, 'ſo much ſeemingly profeſt by you, to the a-

'muſing of many unwary People, we hereby 'ſincerely Declare, that we are herein one with 'our Antient and Faithful Brethren, firmly be-'lieving what is upon Record in the Holy Scrip-'tures, concerning God, concerning our Lord 'and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, both with Reſpect 'to his appearance in the Fleſh, and to his ap-'pearance in the Spirit, concerning the Holy 'Ghoſt, the Reſurrection-State, and Eternal 'Judgment, which, though offered unto you, 'to the ſame purpoſe, and that ſeveral times; 'yet was rejected, as inſufficient by you. And ſo, it ſeems, it is now too. For he objects againſt it, Firſt, that it is *two ſhort*, as being but about *Eleven Lines*: So that it ſeems, *a multitude of words* would have pleaſed him better. But I thought, in things of this Nature Eſpecially, he would have regarded *weight*, rather than *Number* of words. And as few Lines as this is contained in, I know not whether that called *The Apoſtles Creed* be much longer. He thinks much to be put off with *Eleven Lines* of a Confeſſion of Faith: And I do not think *Eleven Volumes* would ſatisfy him, unleſs they were of his own writing. But he that ſhall heedfully read theſe *Eleven Lines*, ſhall find they comprehend the *Principal* Doctrines, about which he pretended to be diſſatisfied. But it is not the *Brevity* only that troubles him. He is offended that they ſay, they *Firmly believe what is upon Record in the Holy Scriptures*. At this he *huffs*, ſaying, *ſo will every Papiſt ſay, every Socinian ſay, and every Mugletonian; for it is a common Fallacy, that the Vileſt of Hereticks uſe, whereby to deceive People,*

People, to tell them they Firmly believe all that is Recorded in the Holy Scriptures concerning God, Christ, &c. I know not whether *Tertullus*, who accuſed *Paul* to *Felix* (Acts 24.) were *a greater Orator* than G. K. but I am perſwaded he was *not ſo great a Sophiſter*, nor ſo void of common Charity. Neither would the Apoſtle have gon off as he did, had G. K. been then, and in *Tertullus* his place, when *Paul* ſaid He *believed all things that were written in the Law and the Prophets*, ver. 14. G. K. asks, *why have the People called Quakers, Separated from the ſeveral Profeſſions of Chriſtianity, upon the account of Errors in Doctrine, which they did charge them with, ſeeing all theſe Profeſſions in general terms ſay as much as we, that they Firmly believe what is upon Record in the Holy Scriptures?* I anſwer, Firſt, That the People called Quakers did Separate from other Profeſſions, *not only* becauſe of the Errors in Doctrine which they charged them with, *but alſo* becauſe thoſe Profeſſions in general, were departed from the Power and Life of Godlineſs, and withſtood and denied the Inward Appearance of Chriſt in his People. And Secondly, As far as they did ſeparate on the Account of Doctrines, it was becauſe they found thoſe Doctrines, even as thoſe Profeſſions themſelves had ſtated them, to be *not according*, but *contrary to* what was upon record in the Holy Scriptures.

He ſays, *We have often told* T. L. &c. *Let them condemn thoſe groſs and vile Errors, which we have proved ſome of them guilty of, and others cloak and excuſe them,* &c. *and that ſhall ſatisfie us in*

this point. But have not *T. L.* and Friends, often, if not as often, told him, that *he has not proved them guilty* of thoſe groſs and vile Eerrors he talks of, nor others of cloaking and excuſing them? And yet he will not be ſatisfied; of which more in his next Perverſion.

He ſays, *Many hold, to my certain knowledge, That the Reſurrection is the New Birth, and nothing elſe: Others ſay, Immediately after Death we get the Reſurrection fully.* If by *many* that hold thus, he means many of the People called Quakers, I neither own nor know any that hold ſuch Doctrines.

So alſo his other ſaying, viz. *This groſs and vile Error, That Chriſt is not to come without us, in his glorified Body to judge all mankind, I find too many in* England *guilty of*; I eſteem as a vile ſlander; if, by many, he intend many of the People called Quakers. And his ſuggeſting, *that too probably they have drunk it in from ſome unſound Expreſſions in ſome of the printed Books too generally owned by them*, diſcovers in him an unſound and evil mind: And ſpeaks his inclination to quarrel with Friends in *England*, as well as he has already done in *America*.

His Twenty Firſt Charge againſt me is, Of *Perverſion* and *Fallacy*, in *covering theſe Men*, becauſe of their ſaying in their Papers, *If any of us, or any countenanced by us have given you any Offence, either by any unſound Expreſſions, or by any ungoſpel-like Converſation, and the ſame be made to appear by credible Teſtimonies, We promiſe unto you, that if the Parties concerned do not condemn the ſame,*

they

they ſhall be diſowned therein. To this fair offer he ſays, *What more credible Witneſſes could be deſired, than the ſeveral Manuſcripts ſigned with their own hands, whom they have owned,* &c? But I ask him, Did he upon this Offer, complain to thoſe Friends who made it, of any of them, or countenanced by them, that had uſed unſound Expreſſions? Did he produce the Manuſcripts he mentions, as Witneſſes againſt thoſe that Writ them? Did the Monthly Meeting to which the Parties belonged refuſe to hear his Complaint? Did they reject his Manuſcript Evidences? If he did, upon this offer, make ſuch Complaint, if he did produce his Manuſcripts in Evidence, let him make appear when, where, at what Monthly Meeting he did this. But if he did not this, what he ſays now of it is but *Fallacy* and *Deceit.* Nor do I think it proper to take notice of what he now mentions out of his Manuſcripts, becauſe I do not think it ſafe to take it upon his Report.

His Twenty Second, He calls my Perverſion of his words, which were *That* (after the Separation was actually begun, and he and his Party met apart from Friends) *he went to the Friends Meeting, and did there declare, that He and his Friends had Unity with the moſt there as to the main.* From whence I inferr'd, 'If there had been ſuch 'groſs, vile and unchriſtian Errors, againſt the 'Fundamental Doctrines of the Chriſtian Faith, 'ſuch damnable Hereſies, and Doctrines of De'vils, held amongſt them, as he ſuggeſts, and 'cloaked, or covered, and tolerated by them,

'How

'How could he ſay that he and his Friends had 'Unity with the moſt there, as to the Main? This he would ſhift off, by alledging, That *more than two thirds of that Meeting were Country Friends, who were come to that Meeting upon notice that* J. Dickinſon *was to be there, and that there had not been any Breach between thoſe Country Friends and him at that time.*

But this is a *meer Fallacy.* For it was not with reſpect to thoſe Country Friends, that he ſaid he had Unity with the moſt there; but with reſpect to the Friends of that Meeting: For he ſays, he alſo *ſignified his deſire to be United to that Meeting*; not to the Friends of other Meetings in the Country (for with them, he ſays, he had had no Breach) but *to that* Meeting.

And his connecting his Deſire to be united *to that* Meeting, with his Declaration, that he and his Friends had Unity with the moſt *there*, reſtrains his declared Unity to the Friends *of that* Meeting; and that Unity being declared to be as *to the main*, (that is in the main and fundamental Doctrines of Chriſtianity,) his ſeparating from that whole Society, or Meeting of Friends, with the *moſt* of whom he declared he had Unity *in the Main*, even after he had ſeparated from them, is a Fault he can never juſtifie, nor excuſe, by all the Fallacies he can invent.

23. What I ſaid in the 45, and 46. pages of my Epiſtle, concerning the ſending over his ſcandalous Books from *America*, to one in *London*, who is not a Quaker, for him to expoſe to Sale

as

as he would; and *G. K.*'s. blaming them that reprinted his Books here, not for reprinting them, but only for altering their Titles, he passes over in silence, and Cavils at my shewing his Deceit in the use of the word *many* (in his Causeless Ground, p. 12.) where he said, *It is my charitable sincere Perswasion, that the worthy name of Christian doth truly belong to very many of that People, as well as unto me.*

From hence I inferr'd, 'He will not allow it '(it seems) to the People called Quakers, or to 'the Body of Friends, as a People, no not so 'much as from a charitable Perswasion. And 'how insincere he was, in pretending to allow 'it to very many of that People, I shewed by his following words, which were, *Having an experimental Proof, through intimate Conversation, and frequent verbal Communication with many of them, that they are sincere in the Christian Faith,* &c.

From whence I shew'd, 'To what a narrow 'scantling he had reduced his application of the 'name Christian among the Quakers, and how 'few he meant by *very many*; even just so many 'as he hath an experimental Proof of, through 'intimate Conversation, and frequent verbal 'Communication with them, which how many 'they may be, judge ye (said I) considering 'how short a time he had then been in *England*, 'and in that time scarce or little out of *London*, 'nor very conversant with Friends there.

This he calls (as he doth most things) a gross Forgery and Perversion; and says, *I did really mean not them only, but all them, whom I have at any*

any time formerly had Experience of their Chriſtianity, by intimate Converſation, and verbal Communication, either in England, *or any other part of the World, that have given me no Occaſion to think otherwiſe of them.* This *Fallacy* will not help him. For as his *Charitable Perſwaſion* is grounded on his *Experimental Proof*, and that *Proof* drawn from *intimate Converſation*, and frequent *verbal Communication:* So that intimate Converſation, and frequent verbal Communication is reſtrained, by his own Words, to the time ſince he came laſt into *England*. For it is all in the *Preſent Tenſe*, none in the Preterit; having (not having had, but now having) *an Experimental Proof through intimate Converſation, and frequent verbal Communication, with many of them, that they are* (not that they have been formerly, many Years ago, when I was in *England* before; but that they now are) *ſincere in the Chriſtian Faith, and whoſe Life and Converſation* doth *ſeal* (not hath ſealed) *unto the ſincerity of their Chriſtian Profeſſion.*

By this, Friends, ye may ſee that I neither forged, nor Perverted his Words: But that he hath now put a falſe meaning upon his Words, which they will not bear. And that by *very many*, he meant *thoſe only* that cleave to, or favour him, may be gathered from the *boaſt* he makes at the Entrance of his *Loving Epiſtle* (as he calls it) of the *conſiderable* Number he hath *Experience* are in Unity with him.

24. He

24. He calls it a Perverſion of his words, that when (in contradiction to the Advice of the Yearly Meeting, that he ſhould call in his Books, or at leaſt publiſh ſomething innocently and effectually, to clear the Body of the People called Quakers, and their Miniſters, from thoſe groſs Errors charged on ſome few in *America*) he denied that he had charged the People called Quakers, either in general, or in the plurality; I ſaid, I had not found in his laſt Book, that he had cleared, or attempted to clear, the People called Quakers, there in general, or in the plurality; and that he was ſcarce willing to allow the Name Chriſtian to any more of them, than he had had experimental proof of, through intimate Converſation and frequent verbal Communication, *&c.* In this he ſays I pervert his words, and yet labours to juſtifie himſelf, for not allowing the Name Chriſtian to the People called Quakers, from an Epiſtle of *G. W's.* to Friends. *How* (ſays he) *can he, or I either, be poſitive to ſay, the People called Quakers are good Chriſtians, either in general, or in the plurality, when* G. W. *hath told us in his printed Epiſtle—— That few ſincerely ſeek the Lord? &c.* So that he quarrels with me, for ſaying how unwilling he was to allow the Name Chriſtian to the People called Quakers; and yet urges *G. W's.* Epiſtle to juſtifie himſelf for not allowing the Name Chriſtian to the People called Quakers, either in general, or in the plurality.

And

And reciting divers passages from that Epistle, (tending in a general way, to shew that many fall short of that watchful, diligent, close walking with the Lord, and inward Exercise of Mind towards him, that they should have: And too many are taken up with fading Objects, or cumbred with the Cares of this Life) he endeavours from thence to justifie himself, for having exposed in Print to the scorn and contempt of the World, and in the most reproachful terms and manner, both many particular Persons by Name, and whole Meetings of Friends. For, says he, *Nothing can be said against my printed Books, in reference to my publick witnessing against the Errors in Principles, whereof some are guilty in* Pensylvania, *and elsewhere, but what may be as much said against* G. W. *his reproving those great Vices and Immoralities among many called Friends, &c.* That the *falsness* of this Comparison, which he makes between *G. W's.* Epistle and his own Books, may the better appear, let it be considered, that his Books contain the *blackest* Charges, with respect to Errors in Principles, that Man can be guilty of, *viz. gross and vile Errors, contrary to the Fundamentals of Christianity, Damnable Heresies, and Doctrines of Devils*, held by some, and covered or cloaked, and tolerated by others. But did *G. W.* in that Epistle charge any with the *grossest Debaucheries, Uncleanness, Prophaneness, Dishonesty*, &c. that Mankind is or can be guilty of? Or do his words import any more than a *remisness*, slackness, or falling short of duly Exercising Spiritual Gifts, and being too much taken up with the things

things of this World? And did he ſay, that ſuch as were *faulty* in thoſe things, were *cloaked*, or *covered* and *tolerated* therein by Friends? No ſuch matter. Therefore *G. K.* ſays falſly, in ſaying (as before) nothing can be ſaid againſt his Printed Book, *&c.* But what may be as much ſaid againſt *G. W*'s, *&c.* And it is obſervable, that *no publick Reproach* was caſt, by Truth's Adverſaries, upon Friends and Truth, from that Epiſtle of *G. W*'s: whereas *G. K*'s filthy and ſcandalous Books have brought very *great Reproach* upon Truth and Friends, from the Adverſaries thereof. So that *G. K*'s bringing *G. W*'s Epiſtle to juſtifie his own *infamous* Books, ſhews his own *falſneſs*, but will not defend, or excuſe him.

Nor can he be excuſed for the Wrong, and Miſchief, he hath done, in publiſhing thoſe Scandalous Books of his, which he acknowledges he had a *foreſight* and *ſenſe* the Enemies of Truth would ſeek to take advantage from; though he adds his ſenſe and foreſight, that, *in the concluſion, they would be diſappointed*: As I alſo believe they will, by ſeeing, in the concluſion, his Deceit fully laid open, and Truth and Friends cleared from his falſe Accuſations. Their *diſappointment* he refers to the *Concluſion*: But the *Advantage* he has given them, by the miſchief he has done, is *preſent*; and he is induſtriouſly endeavouring to do more. He ſays, *He did not think the ſimple Relation or Account of theſe things, would or could be any proper cauſe of grief to faithful Friends, &c.* Is this fit for a Wiſe Man to ſay? A Boy from his Accidence could have told him that it is

Inſi-

Inſipientis dicere non putâram; the property of a Fool (when he has done miſchief) to ſay, I did not think, or I had not thought.

25. He would ſeem here to be very Zealous for the Yearly Meeting at *London*, and arraigns me for groſs Perverſion and Reflection on the Yearly Meeting: And yet before he paſſeth from this Head, he kicks the Yearly Meeting out of Doors, and diſowns it to be a Yearly Meeting, or any duly conſtituted Meeting at all. *Nor can it be ſaid*, (ſays he, p. 27.) *that that called the Yearly Meeting, was a free Meeting, for it was too private, and limited to too ſmall a number*, &c. *and therefore it cannot be owned to be the Yearly Meeting, nor any Meeting duly and regularly conſtituted*, &c. Ye ſee now, Friends, whither he is run, and to what a paſs he is come; having *outrun*, in this, (ſo far as I remember) all the Apoſtates that have gone before him. He diſowns it to be a Yearly Meeting, or any Meeting at all duly conſtituted; and yet takes upon him to impeach me of Perverſion and Reflection on the Yearly Meeting. Is not this *groſs Hypocriſie* in him?

The Perverſion and Reflection he charges me with, is my ſaying, '(Suppoſing it were true in 'Fact, that no Untruth or Falſhood in matter of 'Fact, had been diſcovered in his Books) it was 'not the proper buſineſs of the Yearly Meeting 'to judge of the matters of Fact, contained in 'his Books, which were alledged to have been 'done in *America*, by Perſons not here to anſwer 'to, or give account of them. And that none 'ſhould think, that becauſe the Yearly Meeting 'did

'did not declare the matters of Fact in his Books 'to be false, therefore they are all true. They 'remain, said I, to be proved by him that has 'affirmed them, and to be answered by them 'who are charged therein.

Now, though I suppose I have said enough to this matter, in the former part of this Book, in Answer to his *Loving Epistle* (as he calls it) to satisfie any reasonable Person. Yet because he repeats it here, I will not stick to take notice of it again. From my last Cited words, he notes, that I *grant the Yearly Meeting did not declare the matter of Fact in his Books to be false; and seeing* (as he says) *for matter of Doctrine they did not blame him, and yet he is blamed, he thinks I cast an unparalleled instance of Injustice on the Yearly Meeting, to blame him for things in his Book, that are neither matter of Doctrine, nor matter of Fact.* In this he is very fallacious, playing upon the Words [*Matters of Fact.*]

His Books contain many particular Matters, alledged by him to have been said or done, by many particular Persons in *America*, who were not at the Yearly Meeting at *London*, to Answer to, or give an Account of them.

These Matters of Fact, I said, it was not the proper business of the Yearly Meeting to judge of; (so were my words expressly, Epistle p. 49. *viz.* 'It was not the proper business of the 'Yearly Meeting, to judge of the Matters of 'Fact, contained in his Books, which were al-'ledged to have been done in *America*, by Per-'sons not here to answer to, or give account 'of them.)

And to *these* Matters of Fact I referr'd, when I added, p. 50. 'Therefore let none think 'that because the Yearly Meeting did not de-'clare the Matters of Fact in his Books to be 'false, therefore they are all true. They re-'main to be proved (said I) by him that has 'affirmed them; and to be answered by them 'who are charged therein. *Viz. Those* particular Persons, who he says have said or done *those* particular Words or Deeds, by him charged, in his Books, upon them. What I there spake of *those particular* Matters of Fact, he stretches to Matter of Fact *in general*, and thence *falsly* inferrs, that I deny it was the proper business of the Yearly Meeting to judge of *any Matter of Fact at all* contained in his Books, or that the Meeting did declare *any Matters of Fact at all* in his Books to be false. And he argues upon it at a wild rate.

Is not my clearing my self (says he) *of the blame of the Separation* (for despairing to acquit himself of the fact of Separation, he would now excuse himself of the blame of it) *a Matter of Fact in my Book? This* (says he) *he saith, the Yearly Meeting hath not declared to be false in Matter of Fact, therefore they have not declared it, that my clearing my self of the Separation, is false; and consequently, they have not declared the contrary, but that my clearing my self of the Separation is true*; and from hence again he infers, that I have contradicted the Judgment of that called, *The Yearly Meeting Paper*, which layeth the Separation at his door.

Now,

Now, (beſides that his Argument is faulty and naught, the Terms in his Conſequence not anſwering the Terms in his premiſes) his way or manner of arguing here is meerly Sophiſtical, and grounded upon a falſe Poſition; That I ſay, the Yearly Meeting hath not declared [*This*] to be falſe, (*This, viz.* His clearing himſelf of the blame of the Separation) whereas I never ſaid ſo; and his ſaying I have ſaid ſo, is that in him, which he would have called groſs Perverſion, if not Forgery in me. But as my not ſaying ſo, clears me from his Charge of contradicting the Yearly Meeting in that; ſo that Meeting's *laying the Separation at his Door*, is at leaſt an implicit Declaring, that what he hath ſaid for the clearing himſelf of the Separation, or the blame thereof, *is falſe.*

Nor will his other ſhift ſtand him in any ſtead, to acquit him from being the *culpable* Cauſe of the Separation; which he endeavours to draw from thoſe words in the Yearly Meetings Paper, *viz. As to the Separation among Friends in* America, *ariſing from the unhappy Differences, &c.* From whence he infers, that the Meeting makes the Differences between them in *America*, to be the Cauſe of the Separation.

And from thence argues thus, *And ſeeing the Original ground and Cauſe of the Differences, was the unſound and Erroneous Doctrines held by them of the other ſide, which that Paper called,* A true Account of the Proceedings, *&c. doth own them to be guilty of, it plainly appears, they of the other ſide, were the culpable Cauſe of the Separation,* &c.

Here again *he is guilty of that*, which he ſo often chargeth me with, *Forgery* and *Perverſion*.

He ſays, The Paper called, *A true Account of the Proceedings*, &c. *doth own them of the other ſide to be guilty of unſound and Erroneous Doctrines*. How falſe and unfair he is in this, the words of that Paper ſhall ſhew, which are theſe; *And although it appears that ſome few Perſons have given Offence, either through Erroneous Doctrines, Unſound Expreſſions, or Weakneſs, Forwardneſs, want of Wiſdom and right Underſtanding*; yet, *&c.*

Here ye ſee, Friends, that that Paper of the Yearly Meeting is ſo far from owning them of the other ſide as he calls them (that is, the Friends in *America*) to be guilty of unſound and Erroneous Doctrines (which *G. K.* here expreſly ſays it doth) that it doth not undertake to determine whether the Offence (ſaid to be given by ſome few Perſons) was through Erroneous Doctrines, and Unſound Expreſſions, *or* through Weakneſs, Forwardneſs, want of Wiſdom and right Underſtanding: And yet this Man hath the Confidence, and Falſeneſs to ſay *poſitively*, That Paper doth own them guilty of *holding* Unſound and Erroneous Doctrines. By this ye may ſee how falſe he is; and how unfit he is to charge another with Forgeries and Perverſions.

This looks the worſe in him, in as much as he, who here ſays, the Yearly Meeting owns them of the other ſide to be guilty of Unſound and Erroneous Doctrines, doth (in his cauſeleſs ground of ſurmiſes, p. 5.) ſecretly ſmite at that Meeting, for *leſſening* and *extenuating* ſuch groſs and vile

vile Errors with the *ſmooth name of Weakneſs*. So that when his Blow is at the Yearly Meeting, he ſuppoſes them *not to own* the Friends guilty of Erroneous Doctrines, but of Weakneſs only: But when he ſtrikes at the Friends in *America*, he affirms the Meeting *doth own* them guilty of Erroneous Doctrines: Thus, *Ambodexter*-like, he *plays with both hands*, as he apprehends it will make for his advantage.

Now this feigned Proof of his, being taken away, his Argument falls; and his ſuppoſing the Original ground and Cauſe of the Differences, to be the Unſoundand Erroneous Doctrines held by them of the other ſide, is but a vain Begging of the Queſtion. Nor need the Original ground and Cauſe of thoſe Differences in *America*, be ſought for farther, or elſewhere, than in his own Ambitious, Quarrelſome, Reſtleſs temper and Spirit, which rather than be quiet, or let others be ſo, would create matter for Differences, by *laying Trains* in Diſcourſe to trap and draw ſimple and *well-meaning* Men, to let fall ſome *weak* Expreſſions, which by *wreſting* and *miſconſtruction*, might be brought to ſound unſoundly.

His mentioning the Differences betwixt *Luther* and the Church of *Rome* (the application whereof he ſays, is eaſie to the caſe in hand) ſhews his *Proud Conceit* of himſelf, and his vile Thoughts and *contempt* of Friends, notwithſtanding his *Hypocritical* pretences elſewhere, of being in Unity, and intending to remain in Unity, with all Faithful Friends every where: Which I wiſh all Friends every where would

well note. For *Luther*'s difference, and Separation, was with, and from the whole Church of *Rome*.

I hinted before, *G. K*'s disowning the Yearly Meeting at *London*, to be the Yearly Meeting, or any Meeting Duly and Regularly constituted, which he doth more especialy in *page* 27. and then says, *And this may clear me of these unjust and groundless Occasions, wherewith T. E. doth load me, as being guilty of Insincerity, Hypocrisie, Double-dealing, having not a Conscience* &c. *for my saying, in my Introduction to my Treatise,* The Causless Ground, *&c. I tenderly intreat and desire that none apply or construe any words contained in these following Lines, as intended by me in way of Reflection, Blame or Charge, against either the Body of Friends in general, or any particular Meeting or Meetings of Friends in particular, or against any Singular faithful Friend or Friends whatsoever.* It seems by this, he had this *equivocal* [illegible] in his mind, that not esteeming that [illegible] to be the Yearly Meeting nor indeed any [illegible]eeting at all, duly and regularly constituted, nor the Friends that made it up to be faithful Friends; he might throw his Reflections, Blame and Charge, freely enough upon that Meeting in general, and the Members thereof in particular, without interfering with his premised desire, that none would apply or construe any words contained in that Book, as intended by him in way of Reflection, Blame or Charge, against either the Body of Friends in general, or any particular Meeting or Meetings of Friends in particular, or against any Singular faithful Friend or Friends whatsoever. But

what

what a *depth* of *Deceit* muſt lodge in him the meanwhile?

26. He Charges me with Perverſion in ſaying, *The Hurt, Miſchief, Diſhonour, Reproach, Grief, that have fallen on the Holy Name of God, his Truth and People reſpectively, by the Printing and publiſhing his Scandalous Books, are the proper and direct Effect thereof.* And he ſays, *I bring no proof for it, but that it is apparent.* I ſay there needs no proof for that, that is apparent, as this is. And it is apparent alſo, that he had a *ſenſe* and *foreſight*, before he Printed them, that the printing and publiſhing thoſe Books of his, would have that *evil Effect*, which he himſelf confeſſed in the beginning of one (I think the firſt of them, *Reaſ. of Sep.* p. 2.) where he ſaid, *It is too probable the Enemies of Truth, and of all true Religion, will ſeek to take advantage therefrom, and think themſelves greatly gratified thereby, ſo as to rejoyce the more in their Iniquity, and glory over the Sincere Lovers and Profeſſors of Truth.*

What greater hurt or miſchief could any do againſt the Truth, than to give advantage to the Enemies of Truth, and of all true religion, and thereby ſo greatly to gratifie them, that they ſhould rejoyce the more in their iniquity, and glory over the ſincere Lovers and Profeſſors of Truth? And to do this knowingly, and againſt a *fore-ſight* and *ſenſe*, that the Enemies of Truth, and of all true Religion, would ſeek to take this advantage? Did the Prophets, *John*, *Chriſt*, the Apoſtles, any of thoſe he would ſhelter himſelf under, ever do any thing like this? Nay ſure.

And had he not been heady, high-minded, self-willed and regardless of Truth; the *fore-sight* and *sense* he had of that, which we have since seen come to pass (*viz.* That the Enemies of Truth, and of all true Religion, have not only sought, but found, and taken the Advantages he has given them, and gratified them with, to rejoyce the more in their (and his) Iniquity, and glory over the sincere Lovers and Professors of Truth;) would have stopt him from publishing those *Scandalous* Books of his, which have been the proper and direct Cause of so great hurt and mischief. To excuse himself from which he again attempts in vain, to frame an Argument from my having said, *The Yearly Meeting did not declare the matter of Fact in his Books to be false; and since for matter of Doctrine, they have not* (says he) *charged me in the least; how then can a Book, which hath nothing of Untruth or Falshood in it, be the proper cause of hurt?* In this he useth a Double fallacy; one in stretching the words of mine, concerning matters of Fact, to a *general* sense, which are expressly restrained in my Books, to *particulars*. The other, in inferring that his Book, *hath* nothing of Untruth or Falshood in it; because the Yearly Meeting, who were not acquainted with the particular matters of Fact, did not *declare* that his Books containe any Untruth or Falshood in matter of Fact; as if there could be no Untruth or Falshood in a Book, unless it were declared to be in it. What sort of Logick is that? Will he stand by it? That if a Meeting doth not declare a Book to contain any Untruth or Falshood in it, it thence follows, that that Book hath nothing

of

of Untruth or Falſhood in it? He knows this is falſe Reaſoning, and he may bluſh to have offered it. And as he ſays, *ex veris, nil niſi verum*; ſo I may ſay to him, *ex falſis, nil niſi falſum*, and *ex malis, nil niſi malum*: From ſuch falſe and evil arguing as his is, he can bring forth nothing that is good.

27. His 27th ſeemeth to be ſplit off from his 26th, only to *encreaſe the number*, that he may not fall ſhort at laſt of his Tale; for upon my ſaying, he has been ſo far from endeavouring to wipe away the Reproach his Scandalous Books have caſt on Truth and Friends, that in his laſt (called, *The Groundleſs Cauſe of Surmiſes*, &c.) he hath ſought occaſion, by ſecret ſlurts, to throw more on; ſuggeſting as if the Yearly Meeting was guilty of covering or cloaking thoſe vile Errors he exclaim'd againſt, and of leſſening them with the ſmooth name of Weakneſs. He replies, *How can faithful witneſſing againſt Error, be adhering to Reproach on Truth, and Friends of it? he may as well ſay, one contrary produceth another*, &c. Ye ſee now Friends, how forward he is advanced in his Charge of Error, and what ye may expect from him, when ever he ſhall have a mind to throw Dirt upon any, or all of you. He can inſtance himſelf under the pretence of faithful witneſſing againſt Error, and then tell you ye may as well ſay Truth produceth Error, Light Darkneſs, Good Evil, as that he doth Evil in throwing Dirt on you.

28. His

28. His next Cavil, which he calls Perverſion and Fallacy in me, is, *that I ſeem to own the Doctrine in his Book, and yet altogether wave the chief thing of Doctrin, wherein the Controverſie*, he ſays, *lieth betwixt them of the other ſide and him, and as he judges betwixt him and me*, viz. *That the faith of Chriſt, as he died for our Sins, and roſe again, is neceſſary to our Chriſtianity and Salvation; that God doth juſtifie us, and pardon our Sins for Chriſt's ſake, who died for us; through our Faith in him, that is always accompanied with ſincere Repentance.* In this he hath judged wrong; for I have no Controverſie with him about this Doctrine, which I own as well as he. And if he had not had a *wilfully bad* memory, he might have remembred that himſelf hath cited a Paſſage out of a former Book of mine, (*Foundation of Tythes ſhaken*, p. 240.) where I ſay, "If any one expects Remiſſion of Sins by any other way than "the Death of Chriſt, he renders the Death of "Chriſt uſeleſs. This Paſſage which I then urged againſt the Prieſt, on behalf of the Quakers, clears me now from *G. K*'s. groundleſs ſuggeſtion. His Cavil at me now is, for not reciting the fore-mentioned Doctrine (of the Faith of Chriſt, as he died for our Sins, *&c.*) when I recited other Doctrines out of his Book; and he takes advantage thence to call this *the chief Doctrine in Controverſie* betwixt him and them of the other ſide. By this I perceive I muſt either quote *all*, or *nothing* out of his Books, if I mean to eſcape his Cenſure; for I am perſwaded had I recited this, and omitted any other of the Doctrines he mentioned, that Doctrine

ſhould

ſhould then have been ſingled out for the *chief* Doctrine in Controverſie betwixt him and them, whatever it had been. The truth is, I omitted to recite that, as not underſtanding he had reputed that a Doctrine in Controverſie between him and them. And therefore I choſe to recite thoſe Doctrines about which I apprehended he had made the greateſt Clamour. He would increaſe his own, and others Jealouſie concerning me, *by noticing, that I joyn not* (as he ſays) *the works of Sanctification in the Heart, to Chriſt's outward Appearance, but to his inward Appearance.* This he labours to ſhew, from ſeveral Paſſages in my Epiſtle, which mention Chriſt's inward Appearance, and work of Sanctification in the Heart: To all which, I give this ſhort and plain Anſwer; I do not *divide* Chriſt, nor ſet his inward Appearance in oppoſition to his outward. And therefore when I ſpeak of Chriſt's inward Appearance in the Heart, and the work of Sanctification wrought there, I do not *exclude*, nor intend to exclude, his outward Appearance in the Fleſh, and what he did and ſuffered therein for Man's Redemption, from being concerned in our Sanctification, through a living Faith in him. But I do not allow, that the work of Sanctification is wrought in any, by that outward Appearance of Chriſt in the Fleſh, in whom his inward Appearance, by his Light, Grace and Spirit in the Heart, is not known, received and ſubjected unto. And it is this inward Appearance of Chriſt, that gives Man a right knowledge of, and ſaving faith of the outward Appearance of Chriſt.

29. His

29. His next is no leſs a Charge againſt me, than that of *groſs and bold Fiction and Forgery*, in ſaying, "Whatever Jealouſies and Diſſatisfa-'ctions any of other Profeſſions had entertained 'againſt us on this account before, they had 'no ground or occaſion given them therefore; 'whereas now he has given them occaſion, though 'unjuſtly, and without cauſe, to entertain wrong 'jealouſies of us. This he ſays is *falſe in both parts:* 1. *That other Profeſſions had no ground of Diſſatisfaction given them, touching theſe Doctrines, before his Books came forth; for they had* (he ſays) *but too much ground from too many unſound Expreſſions contained in their Books*; (In whoſe Books? he muſt needs mean the Books of Friends; and why not in his own Books, as likely as in any others?) *and which*, ſays he, *ſome of that Profeſſion hath objected unto me.* That Profeſſion, what Profeſſion? We ſpake of other Profeſſions in *general*, not of any one Profeſſion in *particular*. But whatever Profeſſion it was that objected, or whatever were the Expreſſions objected againſt, they were *ſuch*, he ſays, *as he could not anſwer, otherwiſe than to acknowledge them to be unſound.* If this be true, I am perſwaded it was ſince he himſelf came to be unſound. And this Paſſage of his puts me in mind of that filthy Libel, lately publiſhed with the Letters *D. S.* to it, in which I thought I trackt the *print of his Foot*. 2. He ſays, *it is falſe that he has now given them occaſion to entertain wrong Jealouſies of us.* But in this he contradicts Experience, and the ſeveral Pamphlets that ſome of other Profeſſions, *grafting on his Crab-ſtock*, have either reprinted of his, or print-

ed

ed of their own, grounded on his, againſt us, prove what I ſaid to be true. His ſaying, *That it is clear, as the Light of the Noon Day, that particular Perſons among us, are chargeable with erroneous Doctrines*, is without Proof. And if when he ſays, It is clear, he means *by his Books*, it is ſo far from being clear as the Light of the *Noon Day*, that it is not near ſo clear as *Moonſhine*.

30. He quarrels with me for conſtruing his Words, *That the Doctrine of Chriſt crucified*, &c. *was buried in ſilence, as if he underſtood it generally and univerſally*; *whereas* (he ſays) *his Words have a Reſtriction and Limitation very expreſly*; *for* (ſays he, *I do not ſay buried in ſilence by all or moſt part, or oppoſed by all, or moſt part*; *but buried in ſilence by ſome, and oppoſed by others*. So I cited his Words before, and thereupon put the Queſtion, 'What 'ſaying is here, what Exception made, either of 'the Quakers in general, or in the Plurality, or 'indeed of any at all? Buried by ſome, and oppoſed by others, will hardly paſs for a *very expreſs* Reſtriction and Limitation. Nay, according to common manner of ſpeaking, ſome, and others, may be taken to comprehend all in this caſe; eſpecially, when we ſhall conſider, that he repreſents theſe Doctrines as Dead, let fall, extinct; which (as I noted before, though he takes no notice of it) is implied by his Words [*to revive and raiſe up*]. Nor does his *later* Invention help him, to wit, that *he did chiefly intend this, with reſpect to thoſe parts of* America *where the Controverſie began*; for his Word [*Chiefly*] ſhews

ſhews he did intend it *elſewhere* beſides *America*. And he now ſays, *he finds it buried with too many hereaway in* England, *as well as in* America: Nay, *he can conclude no other*, he ſays, *concerning me*. But the beſt on't is, I am not to be concluded by his Concluſions.

31. His One and Thirtieth is worded nonſenſically: But that which I gather to be his meaning in it is, that my ſaying, *The Servant is not to frame his Meſſage himſelf, but to deliver the Meſſage his Lord gives him to deliver*; (which was ſaid to anſwer, or rather obviate an Objection, That thoſe Doctrines relating the Birth, Death, Reſurrection, Aſcenſion, *&c.* of Chriſt, as to the outward Body, are not ſo frequently or conſtantly declared in our publick Meetings, as thoſe that relate to the inward Appearance and work of Chriſt in the heart.) He ſays, *imports, that the Lord doth not call his Servants ſo frequently to preach the Faith of Chriſt without, as of Chriſt within*; *and this*, he ſaith, *proveth, that in the Opinion of* T. E. *the Doctrine and Faith of Chriſt without, is not ſo neceſſary to Regeneration, as the Faith of Chriſt within, or rather not at all abſolutely neceſſary*. This is a *groſſer Perverſion*, on his part of my Words, than any he can charge on me; for the Reaſon I gave for this, was, not that it was *leſs neceſſary*, but that it was *more known*. Therefore I ſaid, *p.* 55. 'When it pleaſed God 'to raiſe up, and ſend forth a true Goſpel Miniſtry again, *&c.* it was agreeable to the Divine 'Wiſdom, to bring to light that which had been 'hidden, to reſtore to the Nations that which had 'been

'been *loſt*, to turn People to that which they 'had been *turned from*, to inſtruct them in that 'which they were moſt *ignorant of*, &c. Hence '(ſaid I,) I conceive it hath come to paſs, that 'they whom the Lord have ſent forth to preach 'the everlaſting Goſpel in this Day, have been 'led and guided by him, to teach People that 'which they knew not, rather than that which 'they profeſt to know before; to open thoſe 'Doctrines of Life and Salvation, which the 'People were ignorant of, and Strangers to, 'rather than thoſe which they were acquainted 'with, and had been all along trained up in. From all which it is very apparent, that I did not deny the Doctrine and Faith of Chriſt without, to be neceſſary to our Regeneration, as well as that of Chriſt within; but that that without was *more* known *already* to the People, than that within.

32. He quarrels with me for ſaying, That *though, as the Apoſtaſy from the life and power of Chriſtianity gained place*, &c. *the inward Appearance of Chriſt by his Spirit in the Heart, was departed from, and the Doctrines thereof generally loſt and forgotten: Yet the Doctrines relating to the outward Appearance of Chriſt in the Fleſh, and what he therein did, and ſuffered for Man's Redemption, were not loſt, but retained and preached through all Ages, and by every ſort or ſect of profeſſed Chriſtians; inſomuch that* G. K. *now calls thoſe Doctrines which he pretends to be raiſed up to revive and raiſe up, ſuch Doctrines as are held in common by us with all other Profeſſions.* This angers him ſo, that I have ſcarce

ſcarce found him more fretful in any part of his Book than here: From whence I conclude he finds himſelf pincht, and would ſupply his weakneſs and want of Argument, with noiſe and angry words. He calls it *Fallacy, Perverſion, Feigning, Threadbare Excuſe, Fig-leaf that cannot cover, deceitful Excuſe, frivolous Excuſe*, &c. His Anſwer is, *The true Doctrin of the Faith of Chriſt without, as he came in the Fleſh*, &c. *was as much loſt in the time of the Apoſtaſy, as the true Doctrine of the Faith of Chriſt within*; to wit, *not the bare hiſtorical literal faith of Chriſt, that I confeſs was not loſt; but the true living Faith, and the Doctrine of it, was as much loſt, as that of his inward Appearance.*

Here he *varies the Terms* from the Doctrines relating to the outward Appearance of Chriſt, (which was the ſubject we were upon,) to the true living Faith, and the Doctrine of it, (which was not the Subject we were upon.) And to prove his Charge againſt me, of Fallacy, Perverſion, Feigning, *&c.* He alledges that the true living Faith, and the Doctrine of it, was loſt in the Apoſtaſy; which it might be, and yet the Doctrines relating to the outward Appearance of Chriſt in the Fleſh, *&c.* might not be loſt, as I aſſerted they were not. This ſhifting the Terms, is a Fallacy and Perverſion in him, and ſeems to be done with deſign to help himſelf off from what he was upon. But he cannot ſo eſcape, he has hampered himſelf too faſt to get off: For in his Cauſeleſs Ground, *p.* 3. this very Doctrine of the Faith of Chriſt without, viz. *That the Faith of Chriſt, as he died for our Sins,*

Sins, and rose again, is necessary to our Christianity and Salvation, and that God doth justify us, and pardon our Sins for Christ's sake, who died for us, through faith in him, that is always accompanied with sincere Repentance, &c. This I say, (which he now says, was as much lost as the true Doctrine of the Faith of Christ within,) is there set by *G. K.* amongst the many great Doctrines of the Christian Faith, (and the first of them,) which he says *we hold in common with all sorts of other Professions.*

But if this Doctrine of the Faith of Christ without was *lost*, as he says it was, how comes it that all sorts of other Professions have it, and hold it *in common* with him, as he says they do? If he and they hold *it in common*, they must hold it as he doth. And that he holds they do so, appears by his saying, *Many of all sorts that frequent our Meetings, of other Professions, are well affected with our Testimony, to the inward Appearance of God in Christ, together with the Holy Spirit in Mens Hearts, while they find us warm and zealous in our Testimony to the other great Doctrines of the Christian Faith, held in common with them.* Of which, in the next Line, he gives this Doctrine of the Faith of Christ without, for the first instance, as I have cited it before. But if all sorts of other Professions hold it, and hold it as he doth, (which they must, if he hold it in common with them,) how can he say (and say truly,) that it hath been *as much lost* in the time of the Apostasy, as the true Doctrine of the Faith of Christ within? Sure he will not say, that the true Doctrine of the Faith of Christ within, is held

in common by him, with them of all sorts of other Professions.

Besides, seeing (as *G. K.* says,) The true Doctrine of the Faith of Christ without, teacheth, *That the only true saving Faith of Christ's Death, &c. is wrought in Mens Hearts, by Divine Illumination, Revelation and Inspiration, and is taught and begot by the Spirit in Mens Hearts*: There is the greater reason that the inward Appearance of Christ by his Light, Grace and Spirit in the Heart, should be the more frequently preached, and Men directed and turned to that *inward* Teaching by the Spirit in their Hearts, that by the Divine Illumination, Revelation and Inspiration thereof, the true Faith of Christ's death, &c. may be begot and wrought in their Hearts.

His 33d, 34th, 35th Charges, relate all to one matter, and seem to be divided and subdivided by him, to make the *greater shew*. The first he calls *a Perversion of his modest Proposition, about correcting some unsound Words in some Friends Books, as if with purpose he would hunt for, discover and expose, if he can, the nakedness of such as in comparison of himself, may justly be reputed and called Fathers in the Truth.* This he thinks an uncharitable construction of his Words, and that *no good Christian that loves the Truth more than Men, would judge the worse of him for correcting them tenderly and Christianly, not as an Enemy, but as a Friend and Brother.* But it may be guessed how tenderly and Christianly he would deal with the *Dead*, by his *harsh* and *unchristian* dealing with the *Living*, whom he has not dealt with us as a Friend and Brother,

Brother, but as an Enemy: His comparing his correcting work to *Sem*'s and *Japhet*'s going backwards to cover their Father's Nakedneſs, gave me fit occaſion to tell him he had miſtook his point, and taken up *Ham*'s work, inſtead of *Sem*'s and *Japhet*'s. For *Sem* and *Japhet* covered the Nakedneſs, which execrable *Ham* had diſcovered and expoſed, as *G. K.* would do. In this he ſays, *I falſly accuſe him*; but inſtead of proving I do ſo, he turns off, and ſays, *I reflect not only on him, but on the late Chriſtian Teachers and Writers, who have corrected the Errors and unſound Expreſſions contained in the Books of them, called the* Greek and Latin Fathers. In comparing the Books of Friends, to the Books of them called *The Greek and Latin Fathers*, he has not done as a Friend and Brother, but as an Enemy; in ſuppoſing Friends Books to have been written by no better guidance, nor clearer ſight, than theirs who lived and writ in thoſe dark times.

He is ſo idle, as to charge me with *perverting the Scripture Words*, in ſaying, *Bleſſed* Sem *and* Japhet *did therefore go backward, that they might not ſee their Father's Nakedneſs.* And he makes this one of my 50 Perverſions, by which you may ſee how hard he was put to it to make his number up. But inſtead of proving this a Perverſion, he ſays, *As if there were not a further matter and myſtery in it.* Perhaps there might be; but if there were, he hath not ſhewed it, nor my Perverſion. But he ſays, *If it had been only that they muſt not ſee their Father's nakedneſs, they might have covered their Face and Eyes, and gone forward, and not ſee their Father's Nakedneſs.* But they took a more

ſure way in going backward, and that which freed them from all ſuſpicion of ſeeing, or being willing to ſee their Father's Nakedneſs.

36. He ſays, I pervert *his modeſt Propoſition*, (for every Propoſition of his is modeſt with him; and perhaps none but his.) *That every one owned by us to be a Member of our Chriſtian Society, give ſome Declaration of their Faith.* This which he calls a *modeſt Propoſition*, I ſhewed from his own Words, was an *Impoſition* of a Verbal Confeſſion of Faith, without which none ſhould be admitted into Church fellowſhip with him. His Words are, *We are convinced and perſwaded in our Conſciences, that God calleth us to ſeparate from ſuch Unbelievers, and not to be yoked together in Church-fellowſhip and Diſcipline with any that we have not proof of by Confeſſion of the Mouth*, &c. *Reaſ. of Sep.* p. 22.

37. He complains alſo, and makes it his 37th Charge, that I pervert his Words, that *he makes a verbal Confeſſion, the Door of admittance into our Society*; which, he ſays, *is altogether falſe*. This depends upon the former, and is proved by thoſe Words of his which I gave for proof of that, *viz.* 'We are convinced (ſaid he) and perſwaded 'in our Conſciences, that God calleth us to ſepa-'rate, &c. and not to be yoked together in 'Church-fellowſhip and Diſcipline, with any 'that we have not proof of, *by Confeſſion of the* 'Mouth, &c. This is that I call Verbal Confeſſion. If he like not the Word *Verbal*, let him take

Oral,

Oral, or Confeſſion of the *Mouth*, which is all one.

From my obſerving out of *R. Barclay*'s Book, called the *Anarchy*, p. 48. (which *G. K.* had perverſly quoted,) that *R. B.* doth not make a bare Profeſſion, verbal Confeſſion or Declaration of Principles, *&c.* to be any Terms at all of Church-Communion, *G. K.* taking it to himſelf, charges a Perverſion on me, and ſays, *This is falſe, I make them not the Terms at all, when the Profeſſion is but barely verbal.* But he hath no ſuch guard in the Place before quoted, where he ſays, *We are convinced*, &c. *that God calleth us to ſeparate*, &c. *and not to be yoked in Church-fellowſhip*, &c. *with any that we have not proof of by Confeſſion of the Mouth, that they are ſound in the Faith.* So that he makes a Verbal Confeſſion, a proof of their being ſound in the Faith, and this makes a Verbal Confeſſion, yea, a bare verbal Confeſſion, ſufficient to yoke them, (as he phraſes it) together in Church-fellowſhip.

His 39th, 40th, and 41ſt, Relate to his pretended Quotations out of *R. Barclay*'s Book, before mentioned, and my Obſervations thereupon, from which he picks ſeveral Quarrels; one, that from his ſaying (as *the expreſs Doctrine of* R. B. though it be not,) *That ſome Principles and Doctrines and Points of Faith are neceſſary to be agreed upon*, &c. *and to be owned, profeſſed and declared by us, to be as it were the Terms that draw us together, and the Bond by which we become centred into one Body and Fellowſhip*, &c. He ſays, *I pervert his Words to a wrong ſenſe; as if his Senſe were, That*

Men

Men were to contrive and cut out their own Terms, and before they entred into a Society or Fellowſhip, ſhould conſider, conſult and conclude among themſelves what Principles, Doctrines and Practices they would have to be the Terms and Bond of their Society. Though this was not ſpoken directly of him, (but with reſpect to the Quotation he *feigned* to give out of *R. B.*) yet he did well enough to take it to himſelf; for I verily think it to be his Senſe, and the Terms he propounded it in, ſpeak the ſame. And though he ſays he did not mean by agreeing, *a humane, political Contrivance or Deſign*, but a *Divine Agreement*; yet I make no queſtion but he meant an Agreement of his *own contriving* and cutting out: And I doubt not that he would call any ſuch thing Divine, that were of his Contriving. He asks, *If I know not that Men may well agree together in one Faith, by the Spirit's inward working in their Hearts, as well as they may agree together in one Prayer, by the Spirit*, &c? I anſwer, Yes, I do. But would he have ſome certain *Form of Prayer* agreed upon, and ſet forth, for all to be obliged to pray by at all times, becauſe Men may agree together in one Prayer by the Spirit? That would be *Common Prayer* indeed. It is one thing to propoſe certain Principles, Doctrines and Points of Faith to be neceſſarily agreed upon, and being ſo agreed upon, a Confeſſion thereof to be impoſed to be owned, profeſſed and declared to be, as it were, terms of Communion, and the Bond of Fellowſhip: And it is another thing to be drawn together by the inward force and vertue of Truth, through the Operation

Operation of the Divine Spirit in the Heart, into an Agreement in the Belief of the ſame Principles, Doctrines and Points of Faith; and ſo alſo to agree ſubſtantially in making confeſſion thereof, when and wherefoever the honour of God requires it of us.

My Diſcovery that he has falſly quoted *R. B.* angers him extreamly, and he *rails* at me for it like himſelf; but that will not clear him. He ſays, *I moſt fraudulently put a falſe gloſs upon his Words, about the Word* [agreed on]; and next, *that I deceive and abuſe my Reader, as if he* (G. K.) *did put the ſame Gloſs upon* R. B's *Words.* But all this is trifling; both his Book and mine are in the Reader's Hands, and I dare truſt it to the Impartial Reader's Judgment. He complains that I endeavour to make the Reader believe he wronged R. B. in citing ſome Words of his, and that becauſe, he *cited not ſo many of his Words, as I cited after him.* This is a foul fallacy; for *G. K.*'s Blame lies not in giving a Quotation out of R. B. *too ſhort*, but in giving a *falſe* Quotation for a true one; or in *forging* a Quotation. For neither in the Words he quoted, nor in that Page, nor in that Book, nor in all the Books of R. B. can G. K. find that which he has pretended to give, as the *expreſs Doctrine* and Teſtimony of R. B. in the 48th Page of R. B's Book, called *the Anarchy*, &c. He ſtruggles to get looſe, but cannot; He ſays, he cited as many of R. B's Words, as were ſufficient to prove, that it is R. B's Doctrine and Teſtimony, that Principles and Doctrines, *&c.* are as it were the Terms that have drawn us together, *&c.* But R. B.

doth

doth not say so of Principles and Doctrines indefinitely, or of the Principles and Doctrines in generaly that we will agree upon to be such; but of those Principles, Doctrines and Practices, into the belief of which we are gathered together, without any Constraint or Worldly respect, by the meer force of Truth upon our Understandings, and its power and influence upon our Hearts.

Again, *G. K.* says he did not say R. B. used the Word [*Agreed*]: See his own Words, in *p.* 8. of his Book called *The causeless Ground of Surmises*, which are these, *That some Principles and Doctrines, and Points of Faith, are necessary to be agreed upon*, &c. *in the express Doctrine and Testimony of* R. Barclay's *Book above mentioned*, pag. 48. I Judge now how little this Man is to be trusted.

He calls it a gross Perversion in me, for insinuating, that in his Book (Some Reasons and Causes, *pag.* 16.) He had cited R. B's Words. *But it was not* (says he) *his Words, but his Doctrine, that I mention in that place, also the substance of it, but not as to that particular circumstance of answering to some plain Questions with Yea, or nay.* Had not I discovered his Falshood in this, he had gon off snug with his Quotation, as a very fair Quotation taken out of R. B's Book. But now he is put to his shifts; and to shift it off, he pretends now that he did not intend to give R. B's *Words*, but his *Doctrine*; and lest that cover should prove too short for him, he falls from the *Doctrine*, to the *substance* of the Doctrine. Now let us repeat again the Quotation

tion he gave, and then let the Reader Judge of it. It is in *p.* 16. *of his Reaſon of the Separation*, where he propoſes, *that we agree together to put* Rob. Barclay's *Doctrine into Practice, which*, ſays he, *is* (He does not ſay, the ſubſtance of which is, but which is) *to declare our* Faith *and Perſwaſion in certain Fundamental Doctrines of the Chriſtian* Faith *and Religion, that by the ſame, as well as by a good* Life *and Converſation, it may be known who are qualified to be Members of our Church, and that every one owned to be a Member of our Church, declare his* Faith *and Perſwaſion in every one of theſe* Fundamentals, *which is a Secondary* Bond *of our Union, the Spirit being the* Principal, *which may be eaſily done by anſwering to ſome plain queſtions, with Yea, or Nay.* Let any one now, that reads theſe words, Judge whether they were not deſigned to perſwade the Reader, that not only this was *R.* B.'s Doctrine, but that theſe were the very words in which he had delivered it. Whereas ye ſee now, *G. K.* not only confeſſes they are *not his words*, but dares not adventure to ſay, they are *plainly* and *directly* his Doctrine; but the *ſubſtance* of his Doctrine: And yet even that I deny. I ſay they are neither *R.* B.'s, *Words* nor *Doctrine*, nor the *Subſtance* of his Doctrine. And had his Quotation lain in a tolerable compaſs to be recited, I would have given it: But he cites for it, *Sect.* 4, *p.* 32, 33. and *Sect. 6. p.* 48, 49. to which I again refer and recommend every Reader, that has or can procure that Book of *R.* B.'s called *The Anarchy of the Ranters*, &c. That *G. K.*'s Deceit herein may be more generally known.

He ſays all my proof, that it is not R. B.'*s Doctrine, is, that I aſſure the Reader, it is not*: But (ſays he) *let the Reader compare my Citations at length,)in my* Reaſon and Cauſe of Separation, *p.* 24, 25. *and he ſhall find it is his Doctrine.* But, beſides my aſſuring the Reader it is not ſo, and my Referring him for certainty to the *Original* Book; I have now too other proofs to offer, which though not poſitive and direct, are *ſtrong Preſumptives* againſt *G. K.* One is, that he hath not attempted to Prove that this is the Doctrine or Subſtance of the Doctrine of *R.* B. in that Book, by producing now *R.* B.'s *own words* to manifeſt it. And the other is, that he doth not now refer his Reader to *R.* B.'s Book for Satisfaction; but to his *own Book*, and the Quotations therein, which he pretends to have taken out of *R.* B.'s Book, which perhaps he may have falſified, as well as this.

42. His next Cavil is grounded on a Quibble, In his *Cauſleſs ground of Surmiſes*, p. 10. he ſaid, *Is it not high time that by the general Conſent, advice and approbation of the moſt Judicious, Wiſe and Underſtanding of Friends now alive, all the moſt neceſſary Principles and Doctrines of our Faith, both common and peculiar, ſhould be publiſhed and made known?* &c. I minding more the *Subſtance* of his propoſition, than *Circumſtances*, Anſwered, *Is that, as a new thing, to be done now?* adding, *What Principle, or Doctrine of our Faith, either common or peculiar, can he aſſign, that hath not been publiſhed and made known, perhaps before he knew either our Faith or us?* He calls this a Perverſion, and ſays, *It is a new thing*

yet

yet to be done; and he believes I am not able to ſhew him that Book where it is done by general Conſent. So that I perceive he expects it *all* in *one* Book. But what if it be done in ſeveral Books, and that by ſome that are *not now* alive, who yet perhaps might be as Judicious, Wiſe and Underſtanding, as any that are now alive? Will not this ſerve his turn? I doubt, Not: For he will *object* perhaps that it has not been done by general Conſent of the moſt Judicious, Wiſe and Underſtanding Friends? He ſays, *It is not the conſent of a few, or of the Second Days Meeting at* London, *who* (that he may ſpeak in the words, as well as from the Spirit of *Core*) he ſays *take too much upon them, that he means, but the general Conſent of the moſt Judicious Friends.* But how will he do to find out the *moſt Judicious* Friends now alive? Who, does he think (himſelf excepted) Judicious enough to Judge, who are the *moſt Judicious*, Wiſe and Underſtanding Friends now alive? But before ſo great and difficult a work be undertaken, it may be fit to conſider what need there is of this. The Apoſtles of our Lord, and the Primitive Chriſtians, contented themſelves without it. Did they ever get together the moſt Judicious, Wiſe and underſtanding amongſt them, to publiſh by their general Conſent all the moſt neceſſary Principles and Doctrines of their Faith, both common and peculiar? I believe he is not able to ſhew me that Book wherein that is done. Yet the neceſſary Principles and Doctrines, of their Faith, both common and peculiar, were publiſhed and made known by ſome or other of them, in their ſeveral writings, though not in one Book, or by ſuch general con-

ſent, advice and approbation, as he now propoſes. And he hath not aſſigned any Principle, or Doctrine of our Faith, (which is the ſame with theirs of old) that hath not been already publiſhed and made known.

His 43, 44, 45. Charges relate to *his Suggeſting* that Friends make plain Language, plain habit, *&c.* Terms of their Communion; which I refuted ſo fully before, that I ſee no cauſe to ſay more to it now, eſpecially ſince he offers nothing of moment now againſt what I then writ.

His 46. he calls Perverſion in me, for chargeing him with *Spurning diſdainfully at the advice given him, to retract the Bitter Language in his Books. Whereas,* ſays he, *I modeſtly promiſe to do it, when they have told me what hard or bitter words I have given to any, that are not due to them, withall deſiring ſome to give me their good Example. Is this,* ſays he, *any diſdainful Spurning?* What is diſdainful Spurning of advice? If to *recriminate* the Adviſers, and charge them *higher* in the ſame kind, be not? For *to their Advice,* ſays he, *I Anſwer, ſome who have ſo adviſed me, ſhould give me their good Example, by retracting their much more bitter Language, and more hard and ſevere Names they have given,* &c. Is not this diſdainful Spurning? And whereas he pretends, that he *modeſtly* promiſed to retract, when they have told him what hard or bitter words he hath given to any that he cannot prove to be due unto them; he muſt remember I put him formerly in mind, that by his own confeſſion he gave his hard Names

and

and words *without proof* of their being due to them. For in his *Plea of the Innocent* p. 11. he ſays, *As for his giving hard Names and Words to any, it was but conditional, upon Suppoſition of their holding ſuch Errors which they did ſeem to favour.* Was this *modeſtly* done? Or like a Chriſtian, to *revile* and *abuſe* Perſons *conditionally*, and upon *Suppoſition*? Why did he not clear himſelf of this? Or confeſs his fault in it? Was it not becauſe he could not do the one, and hath not honeſty enough to do the other.

47. He perſiſts in *retracting the acknowledgment he made in the Yearly Meeting, of his paſſions*, &c. Yet *blames me for ſaying he retracted*, and denies he acknowledged he had juſtly offended any in words or deeds, relating to the differences in *Penſilvania*, or elſewhere. But he anſwers not what I writ of that before (in my 64, 65, 66, and 67. *pages*,) which lies ſtill on him, and will.

48. So will alſo what I there ſaid (from *James* 1. 26. and 3. 11. 12.) concerning his *unbridled* Tongue; which he in vain retorts on me, as guilty of the Perverſions, Fictions and Forgeries, *&c.* he charges: Which being not *real* but *feigned* by him, and charged *without proof*, is a further proof againſt him, that his Fountain is bitter, and his Religion vain.

49. His charging me with Perverſion, in affirming that *he was not condemned in* Penſilvania *without all hearing Conviction and Trial*, is a Perverſion of his own. For (though I believe it is true that he

he was not) yet I did not ſo affirm; but taking notice of his frequent Complaining that he had been Condemned in *America*, without all hearing Conviction or Trial, I ſaid, in a Parentheſis, (*though that is both denied and diſapproved by the Friends there.*) So that his is rather a Perverſion, or falſe Charge upon me.

50. The laſt of his Fifty Charges, he calls a Complex and Bundle of falſe Accuſations and Miſrepreſentations. The parts whereof are;

Firſt, That *I ſay he is not in Unity with faithful Friends.* This is not only too true, but too plain to be doubted.

Secondly, That *I accuſe him of hardneſs in his* ſaying, *I declare my real Intention to remain in Unity with all Faithful Friends.* What elſe could it be, but *extream Hardneſs*, for him to declare his real intention to remain in Unity with all Faithful Friends every where, after he had (as I there ſhewed) broken from the Unity, and gone out into an open Separation from Friends?

Thirdly, That *his Meeting with Friends, and continuing to exerciſe his Gift of Miniſtry* (as he calls it) *amongſt them, is a very great Exerciſe and burden to Friends.* I was not poſitive it is. But I ſaid to Friends, 'If he continue to Meet with 'you in the ſame Spirit, and mind, in which 'he went out from Friends, and made the Breach 'and Separation elſewhere, his Meeting with 'you will be but a Burden to you, and an aggra-'vation of Condemnation to himſelf.

And with reſpect to his Preaching in Friends Meetings, I ſaid, 'While he continues in that

'Evil

'Evil Mind, and Spirit of Contention, Diviſion,
'and Diſcord, wherein he hath of late appeared,
'it muſt needs be a very great Exerciſe and Bur-
'den to you.

But I am not diſſatisfied with his changing the Words from [Will be] and [muſt needs be], to [is]: For I am fully ſatisfied it is ſo; and ye, my Friends, whoſe ſuffering Lot it is to hear him, I make no queſtion, find and feel it ſo.

Fourthly, That *he gave ſuch Interruption, and made ſo great diſturbance at the Firſt Publick Meeting he appeared in at* London (which was at the *Bull and Mouth,) as the like hath ſcarce been known in any Meeting in that City.* Of this there were ſo many Witneſſes preſent, that he might with the like Modeſty deny he was at that Meeting, as that he made ſuch a Diſturbance there.

He aſſerts again his being in Unity, thus; *As I am at preſent in Unity with Faithful Friends, ſo I ſtill declare my ſincere Intention to remain in Unity with Faithful Friends.* But as he is *not* at preſent *in Unity:* So his declared intention to remain in Unity, is *not ſincere.*

He ſays, *Neither I, nor any of my Abettors, can prove him guilty of making any Breach, or Violation of true Unity with Faithful Friends.* Friends, Ye who have his Books, and mine, before you, are the proper Judges of that; and to your Judgment I leave it. But what heed can be given to the Words of a Man, who ſpeaks not plainly, but with Equivocation? In his Cauſeleſs Ground of Jealouſies, *he tenderly intreated that none would apply or conſtrue any Words therein,*

therein, as intended by him in way of Reflection, blame or Charge againſt either the Body of Friends in general, or any particular Meeting, &c. Yet in that Book reflected on, blamed and charged the Yearly Meeting highly. But he had an *Equivocating Salvo* to himſelf, which was that he did not own that to be the Yearly Meeting, or any Meeting at all duly and regularly Conſtituted.

Now he cryes he is in Unity with all Faithful Friends. And how (in his reſerved ſenſe) can that be otherwiſe, ſince he owns none for Faithful Friends, but ſuch as are in Unity with him?

He refers to the Innocency of his Life and Converſation, for Proof of the ſincerity of his Spirit and Heart. But he will get little advantage that way. It is not enough for a Man to be free from groſs Immoralities, and the common Debaucheries of the Age: (For that an Hypocrite will take care to be:) But he that will recommend the ſincerity of his Heart and Spirit, by his Converſation, muſt have his Converſation blameleſs towards God, as well as towards Man: For there is a Converſation in the Church, as well as in the World; and he that orders his Converſation aright, will be careful not to give Offence to the Church of God, as well as not to the World.

What *G. K*'s. Converſation is in the World, I meddle not with. But what his Converſation of late Years hath been, *in the Church*, with reſpect to his raiſing Contention and Strife, ſowing Diſcord, cauſing Diviſions, and making an

open

open Rent and Breach, his unruly and turbulent Carriage and Behaviour, Rayling a tand Reviling Friends at his pleaſure, is too notoriouſly manifeſt to need proof. And therefore, while his Tree brings forth ſuch Evil Fruits, he can have no Relief, by urging, That *the Tree ſhould be judged by its Fruits*; by which it is already judged, and found to be of a corrupt Nature.

He ſuggeſts that *I*, and ſome others who promote my Book, *ſeek to drive him forth from the Unity and Fellowſhip of Friends, and from abiding in the Inheritance of the Lord*; Whereas it is certain and evident, that he was gone from the Unity and Fellowſhip of Friends, *before* my Book was Written, or I had any thing to do with him. And how little he regards the Inheritance of the Lord, to abide in it, may be gathered, not only from his joyning himſelf to the Separate Meeting in *Harp-Lane*, but his going to the Meetings of other Profeſſions of almoſt all ſorts.

He would ſhake off the blame, of having made that diſturbance, which was at the *Bull-Meeting* in *London*, preſently after he came over, by ſaying, *Many can, and do bear him witneſs, that he was not the Cauſe, nor beginning of it.* This I leave to you, Friends of *London*, who were then preſent, to judge of, and to meaſure the Truth of what he ſays in other things, by his falſeneſs in this.

He adds, *It ought not to be reckoned a diſturbance, when Errors and falſe Doctrine is Preached in a publick Aſſembly, in a Zealous Chriſtian*

ſtian Spirit to reprove it, when things are come to that paſs eſpecially, that private Reproof is not regarded. By this he ſuggeſts, that Error, and falſe Doctrine was Preached in that publick Aſſembly at the *Bull*, and that by ſome whom he had reproved privately for the ſame before.

But of this he hath given no Proof, nor Inſtance; both which unleſs he do, he is juſtly to be reputed a falſe Accuſer and Slanderer. But to balance the Diſturbance made at the *Bull*, he puts me in mind of a Diſturbance, which he ſays I made at *Grace-Church*-ſtreet Meeting, in ſpeaking againſt a Perſon, whoſe Miniſtry (he ſays) was well owned by Hundreds, ſome of which, he ſays, cryed out on me; *Shame, Shame.* To which I ſay, I remember well both the time and occaſion of that Diſturbance; which was not made by me, but by a ſort of *Unruly* People that joyned with that unruly Perſon.

As for my part, I did not in that Meeting interrupt that Perſon while he was ſpeaking, but waited long (under a *very great weight* and Burden, that his Preaching brought upon me) until he had done, before I ſpake a word. And when I had cleared my Conſcience in a ſhort Teſtimony to the Meeting, I ſate down *peaceably* again, and did not enter into any Debate, or Strife with thoſe unruly People of the Separation, who, by railing at me, on his behalf, made that Diſturbance that was; and whoſe *abuſive rudeneſs* towards me, made ſome cry out on them; *Shame, Shame.*

And

And ſurely if *G. K.* thinks (as he ſeems here to do) that neither I, nor any other ſhould call it a Diſturbance in him to bear a publick Teſtimony againſt a Man, that *ought not* (he ſays) *to be owned to be a Miniſter of Chriſt:* He ought not to call it a diſturbance in me, to bear a publick Teſtimony againſt that Man, that I then teſtified againſt, *who ought not to be owned to be a Miniſter of Chriſt*, not only becauſe he hat divided himſelf from the Church of Chriſt, by going into, and keeping up an open Separation; but for other matters alſo, relating to Converſation, which that Man well knows, I know of him, and have both privately and publickly reproved him for ſome of them.

But as for *G K.*'s ſaying, that my ſpeaking againſt that Perſon, gave offence to *Hundreds*, it is not to be regarded; it being his way, and words of courſe with him, when he has a mind to *magnify* his matter by Numbers, to uſe the word *Hundreds* at a venture. So he does here, thrice in one *page*, —— *gave great Offence to Hundreds;* —— *whoſe Miniſtry was well owned by Hundreds;* —— *Hundreds bear Witneſs*, &c. now that theſe are but *words* of *courſe* with him, and uſed only to deceive, may be ſeen in this laſt Inſtance, of his *Hundreds* of witneſſes, by taking notice what he ſays they bear witneſs too, *viz.* that *my Miniſtry* (ſays he) *is both refreſhing and edifying to them, and is burdenſom to none, but to the Ignorant and unfaithful*, &c. If his Hundreds of witneſſes could have witneſſed truly, that his Miniſtry is refreſhing and edifying to them: Yet if they will take upon them to witneſs, that it is *burdenſome*

denſome to none, but the Ignorant Unfaithful and prejudiced, it is an Hundred to one, if one in an hundred believe them. But by this hint, it may be ſeen what little weight there is in his talk of Hundreds, both in this and his other Books.

He complains of me, for *accuſing his innocent true words, as ſavouring of a Boaſting Spirit, becauſe* (ſays he) *I humbly and modeſtly did mention my Thirty Years Labour in the work of the Miniſtry, and God having bleſt my Labours with great Succeſs, in being an Inſtrument to the bringing many into the bleſſed Unity*, &c. And he *appeals to all that have a true ſavour, whether theſe words ſavour of a boaſting Spirit, he* (as he ſays) *only uſing them by way of argument, to perſwade ſome that had a wrong jealouſy of him, that he intends no breach among faithful Friends.* His modeſty and humility is pretty well ſeen and known by this time. And had not this *boaſting Vanity* been deeply rooted in his Nature, the gentle Touch I gave him in my former Epiſtle p. 70. upon this paſſage now recited, of his ſetting forth his **Thirty** Years Labour in the work of the Miniſtry, and his **Great** Succeſs therein, &c. might have taught him to think *more modeſtly* and humbly of himſelf. But he was ſo far from taking warning by that, that he begins his Epiſtle, which he writ ſince, much after the ſame manner, thus. *Notwithſtanding that I find ſome* (*of whom with reſpect both to my former* **Labour** *of love and* **Service** *in the Truth, towards them, and to my preſent* **Service** *in the Truth*, &c. *I might have expected better things*) *ſo deeply prejudiced*, &c. What elſe doth this be-

ſpeak

ſpeak, but a *fond Conceit* of his own Doings? Many, I believe, who have *deſerved more*, have *leſs ſought* Commendation for their Services. And had he been in the *true Humility*, and in that Charity, which *vaunteth not* it ſelf, and is *not puffed up*, 1. *Cor.* 13. 4. he would have followed the Apoſtle's Counſel, not to think of himſelf *more highly than he ought to think*, Rom. 12. 13. But if it might have becomed him at any time, to have ſpoken ſo highly of his own Services: Yet his doing it now, is as unſeaſonable, as if a Cow, that had given a good ſoop of Milk, ſhould boaſt of the goodneſs or quantity thereof, after ſhe had ſpilt it, by kicking down the Pail. I have no inclination to render his former Services Cheap; which I think he hath but too much done himſelf (though he ſees it not) by coupling them with his preſent Doings. And I give but a Touch on this, not doubting, Friends, that ye will obſerve in thoſe Expreſſions of his, *A Vein of Spiritual Pride*; which he in vain endeavours to cover, by pretending he uſed them by way of Argument, to perſwade ſome; that he intended no breach among Faithful Friends. Which yet, could be but a weak Argument, to them that know and conſider, that Others before him (ſome of whom had laboured long in the Work of the Miniſtry, and perhaps as ſucceſsfully as he) have turned aſide, as well as he, and made Breaches among Friends; of which he himſelf ſeemed formerly ſenſible.

Thus, Friends, I have gone through his Fifty Charges, And ſaid more to them, than either they or he deſerved of me. Which I have done

for

for Truth's ſake, and yours, more than for my own. For I dare truſt to the Goodneſs of the Cauſe I have undertaken, and the Innocency of my Intention, in undertaking it; an Evidence of which I have no doubt to find in the Heart of Faithful Friends.

But my Deſire and Care is, ſo plainly and nakedly to lay open before you, *what Spirit he is of*, and is acted by, and the *miſchievous Deſign* thereof, that none may be longer deceived by him; nor any, by *ſeeming* to countenance him, may ſtrengthen and harden him in his Oppoſition to Truth, to their hurt and his Ruin. I confeſs I cannot treat him as a Friend, becauſe I find him *an Enemy to Truth*.

Yet none could be more glad than I, to ſee him return to a *right mind*. For then he would ſee himſelf to be, what you and I ſee him to be; and would be more forward to condemn himſelf, than to quarrel with others.

But I muſt needs ſay, I have little hopes to ſee ſo good an effect wrought on him; becauſe *I cannot find ſincerity in him*. I gave many Inſtances in my former Epiſtle of his Inſincerity and double Dealing. Since which he hath ſent forth,

Firſt, That Sheet ſingle by it ſelf, which he calls a Loving Epiſtle, but without any ſpark or appearance of Love in it. He directs it to all the Moderate, Judicious, and Impartial among the People called Quakers, intimating thereby, that (in his Opinion) the Quakers, as a Body, or People, are not Moderate, Judicious, or Impartial.

I dare

I dare ſay, ſhould any one of thoſe, that have appeared moſt favourable to him, but thwart him in his way, or reprove him for his Unruline ſs and diſorderly Doings, he ſhall forthwith reject ſuch an One, and raſe him out of his Roll of Moderate, Judicious, and Impartial Ones. And I am perſwaded, ſhould all Friends deal ſo with him (which they have juſt cauſe to do) he would reject them all, and not own one Moderate, Judicious, or Impartial among us.

Do ye not ſee, Friends, how he Slights, Rejects, and caſts off, not only Perſons, but Meetings, at his pleaſure, if they anſwer not his mind?

The Second Day's Morning Meeting, conſiſting moſtly (as ye know) of Miniſtring Friends, he Derides and Scoffs, and Repreſents it as managed by Parties.

The Yearly Meeting he repreſented in his former Paper, (called *The Cauſeleſs Ground*, &c.) as divided: For which I tax'd him in my laſt. In his Epiſtolary Sheet, he doth not vouchſafe to acknowledge it for a Yearly Meeting; but, when he ſpeaks of it, ſays, *That* which *he called the Yearly Meeting*, p. 4. ſo p. 5. and ſo p. 7. Nay, he there ſuggeſts, as if that Paper, called *A true Account of the Proceedings of the Yearly Meeting*, was not given forth by the Yearly Meeting: For ſpeaking of it, he ſays, p. 4. *The Paper ſaid to be given out by the Yearly Meeting*; though after he had heard it Read, it was deliver'd to him, in the Yearly Meeting, in the Name, and as the Act of the Yearly Meeting.

But

But now in his last Book, which he calls *A seasonable Information*, &c. He says downright, p. 28. *As for that, called The Yearly Meetings Judgment, I own it not to be such.*

And of the Meeting its self, he says, *It cannot be owned to be the Yearly Meeting, nor any Meeting* duly and regularly constitute, *&c.* p. 27. So that, Friends, the nearer ye look upon this Man, and the more exactly ye weigh and consider his Words and Actions, the more plainly ye will see his Shifting, Shuffling and Double-Dealing, and that *he is departed from the Simplicity of Truth*; yet uses the Terms of Truth to beguile the Simple by.

For ye see, he calls his Sheet **A Loving Epistle** Addresses it to you, under the kind Compellation of **Dear Friends** *and* **Brethren**; and concludes, that *he remains in true Love your Friend in the Truth*: As if, Who but he to Friends! And who but Friends to him! Whereas, upon all occasions that have hitherto Offered since his last Arrival in *England*, (so far at least as hath come to my notice) when Friends have had to do with him, he regards neither Friend, nor Friends, nor Meetings of Friends, if they do not answer his humour.

And Friends, it is observable, and worth your taking notice of, that in the *Idle Challenge* he made (in the Postscript to his Epistle) to me, and those Friends that approve my Book, for a publick Meeting between him and us, he provides by a particular Caution, that *all Sober and Moderate Persons, whether Friends, or Friendly People, may have freedom to be present.*

What

What elſe doth this beſpeak, but that he hath *more Confidence* in the Populace, than in Friends? In thoſe that are not of us, Than in thoſe that are? Do ye not ſee, Friends, even by this, Where his Life lies? Doth it not appear that he is departed from the Communion of the Saints in Light, and from the Fellowſhip of the Faithful, whoſe Unity is with the Father, and with the Son, in the Eternal Spirit?

And though he directs his Epiſtle to the Moderate, Judicious, and Impartial among the People called *Quakers*: Yet it is the Moderate Perſons (as he calls them) that are *not Quakers*, whom he would have preſent, to make his Appeal to, *againſt the Quakers*, could he but get a Stage to wrangle on. To procure which, he urges that the Scripture ſays, *Of making many Books there is no end.* But how unſeaſonably is this urged by him now, when he ſhould defend his Books, who hath *tumbled out* ſo many Scandalous Books to the diſhonour of the Truth, and Reproach of Friends, as he has done, without any regard to that Scripture? He urges alſo the Example of the *Barbican Meeting*, thereby ſetting, not me only, but the Second Days Morning Meeting, and all Friends that approve and promote my Book, in the place of thoſe envious Baptiſts, that then made War againſt Truth and Friends. By this, Friends, ye may ſee to what a degree he is degenerated, and whither his Envy has run him. But as there is no parallel between that Caſe and this, (thoſe Baptiſts having Blaſphemed the Principle we profeſs, traduced the whole Body of Friends, and in a Mock-Meeting condemned us unheard)

unheard) ſo their yeilding to ſuch a Meeting at Friends demand, will neither excuſe him for demanding the like, nor would have blamed Friends had it been denied. But ſince by his publiſhing his Fifty Charges againſt me, with ſuch proofleſs Proofs as he was able to make thereof, he has put the Cauſe into another way of Tryal, and given every Reader opportunity to judge, both of his Charges and Proofs; I think not my ſelf obliged to take any farther notice of his daring Challenge, than to tell him, that, had he not himſelf ſuperſeeded it by Printing, I ſhould have expected ſome aſſurance of his being reclaimed from that abuſive rudeneſs, wherewith he uſually treats thoſe he contends with, before I ſhould have given him ſuch an Opportunity to gratifie the Rabble; (who in ſuch Aſſemblies, and on ſuch Occaſions, commonly make the greater part:) And to diſgrace his Profeſſion he yet makes of Truth, by ſo publick a diſcovery of his ungoverned Paſſions; the remembrance of which, from the Yearly Meeting, makes me deſire never to ſee the like again.

But Friends, I deſire that both you and I may be kept in the weighty Life, and may dwell in a ſenſible feeling thereof continually, and grow up therein, from day to day, that we may not only be thereby enabled to ſavour, diſcern, and diſtinguiſh Right from Wrong, Good from Evil, that which is of God, from that which is of the Enemy, in his moſt ſpecious appearances; but ſo to cleave to the one, and reject the other, that nothing that is of the Evil one, and which tends to make Rents, Diviſions, and Breaches among

among Brethren, or draw from the Holy Fellowſhip of the Goſpel of Peace, and throw publick Scandals upon our Religious Profeſſion, may receive any Strength, Incouragement, or Countenance from any that profeſs the Truth: But that we may all watch over our ſelves, and over one another for good, in that which is of God. To whoſe Impartial Witneſs in every one of your Hearts, I recommend the foregoing Lines; and in that Love that deſires, and ſeeks the good of the whole Body, and of every particular Member thereof; I remain

Your Friend and Brother,

The 22th, of the 5th. Month, 1694.

T. E.

POSTSCRIPT.

HAD *George Keith* been a Man of any Worthineſs of Mind, or had the Cauſe he manages been defenſible, he would not (though an Adverſary) have ſuffered *John Raunce* to have clapt on his *abuſive Piece* at the End of his Book, thereby to *throw Dirt* at his Opponent. And had not *John Raunce* been an unmanly Adverſary, he would have ſcorn'd to have crept in at the *Tayl* of another's Books, to repeat an *old Slander*, no way relating to the Subject of that Book; when another Book of mine, called *A fair Examination of a foul Paper*, relating chiefly ſo himſelf, hath lain this Twelve Month on his head, unanſwered.

But *George Keith*'s *mean* mind could not, it ſeems, withſtand the *ſlight Temptation* of *John Raunce*'s Offer, to take off an Hundred of his Books: (Beſides, that he was glad of any help to run down his Opponent, if he could, with Slanders, which he found he could not do with Arguments.) And *John Raunce* ſeem'd no leſs glad of the Opportunity, to *creep behind* ſuch a Mickle Man, as *G. K.* is taken to be, and from the Backſide of his Book, to let fly his dirt at me; wherein he has ſufficiently ſhew'd his Envy, and the baſeneſs of his mind. In that former Book, called, *A fair Examination of a foul Paper*, I not only laid open *John Raunce*'s *Notorious Folly*, but plainly convicted him, by ſeveral Inſtances, of downright *Falſhod* and *Lying*; which it did more concern him to have cleared himſelf of, than to renew (as he has done) his former ſlander upon me, about my Father's Burial. But *clear himſelf he could not*; therefore he undertook it not: *Slander me he could*; and therefore did. He had ſpread a Report above a Year ago, That *I did not allow my Father a Shrowd, but that he was wrapt in an Old Moth-eaten Blanket.* When I heard this (and with what Joy, and Glorying, he publiſhed it) I took notice of it, in a Poſtſcript to that Book (which was then juſt ready for the Preſs) and I therein *diſproved* his Falſe Report. But becauſe I ſaid, *I hear John Raunce hath hatched another falſe Story againſt me*, he (waving what I had there ſaid to clear my ſelf of it) catches hold of the Word [*Hatched*] and, under pretence of clearing himſelf (not from having *reported* and *ſpread*, but) from having *hatched* that

Story

Story, he takes the advantage of publiſhing it again, at the end of *G. K*'s. Book, that whereſoever that Book ſhall go, he might defame me. The Account he hath now given of it, is, *That my Father had no other Shrowd but ſomewhat of an Old Moth-eaten Blanket; and it was ſo little and ſo ſhort, that it would ſcare cover his Body.* That *he had no Cap on his Head, nor any Muffler for his Jaws*: And that *The Shrowd was ſo ſorry a Thing, that the* Man, *he* pretends to have had his Relation from, ſaid, *He would not have given* 6 d. *for it*. This Account he pretends to have had from a Man, who, he ſays, helped to lay my Father into his Coffin, and ſaw him Nailed up in the Coffin. But he Names not the Man, nor where he lives, that he might be ſpoken with about it: Which ſhews he had no mind his pretended Author ſhould be found out, and ſpoken with, leſt his own Falſhood ſhould be found out alſo. However, upon *John Raunce*'s Publiſhing this Account, I deſired two Friends of *Aylesbury*, viz. *Thomas Olliffe*, and *James Smith*, to go to *Holton* (the Town where my Father died) and inform themſelves as fully as they could, concerning this matter. I choſe rather to imploy others in this Work, than to go my ſelf, that whatſoever Account ſhould be given thereof, it might be free from all ſuſpicion. Accordingly thoſe two Friends went to the Place, and though they could not find out any ſuch Man as *John Raunce* ſpeaks of (not having his Name to inquire by:) Yet they ſpake with the Man in whoſe Houſe my Father died, and with the two Women that laid out the Body, from whom, and under whoſe hands, they received the following Certificates.

Holton,

Holton, this Second of *December*, 1694.

'WHereas we are informed that a Report is 'ſpread abroad, that *Thomas Ellwood*'s 'Father was Buried in an Old Moth-eaten Blanket 'not worth 6 *d.* We whoſe Names are under-'written, who are the Parties that did lay him 'out, do hereby Certifie, that *we did put on the* 'Body a *New* Shrowd, with *a Cap* and *Muffler*, and 'all things that are uſual for Burial. And that 'there was *no piece of Old Blanket* Buried with him, 'as hath been reported. And the truth of this 'we ſhall be ready to declare to any ſober Per-'ſon that ſhall inquire of us.

The mark of *Mary Weſton.*

The mark of *Mary Stoakes.*

'And for a further Evidence of the Truth of 'this, *I Daniel Stoakes* do declare; that *I bought* 'the Shrowd, of *Thomas Darvall*, of *Wendover*, by 'the order of Thomas *Ellwood*, who *paid me* for 'that, and all other Charges for his Father, 'both in the time of his Sickneſs, and for his 'Burial. And *I alſo ſaw the Corps wrapt in the* 'Shrowd, with the *Cap* and *Muffler*, and *Face* 'Cloth on; and I did alſo help bring him down 'Stairs, and did help carry him to the Grave. 'And *Thomas Ellwood* did, over and above all my

'Charge,

'Charge, give me Ten Shillings, to diſtribute 'to the Poor of the Pariſh, which accordingly I 'did. Witneſs my hand.

Witneſſes hereunto,
Thomas Olliffe. The mark of
James Smith. *Daniel Stoakes.*

Holton December the 10th. 1694.

Whereas it hath been reported that *Thomas Ellwood's* Father was Buried in an Old Moth-eaten Blanket, not worth 6 *d.* This is to ſatisfie all Perſons whom it may concern, that I *Francis Weeden* (who am the Man that made the Coffin, and Nailed it up) ſaw no ſuch thing as a Moth-eaten Blanket: And to the beſt of my memory (it being, as I ſuppoſe, 12 Years ago) he was decently Buried in a Shrowd. And I do believe that no one can truly report otherwiſe. Witneſs my Hand,

Francis Weeden.

Theſe Certificates clear me fully from *John Raunce's Falſe Report*, which he hath ſpread abroad, to the ſhame of his Slanderous Tongue: Let him, if he can, clear himſelf as fairly from having been the *Hatcher* of it. And now he may take the Moth-eaten Blanket to himſelf (if he pleaſe) and ſee if with that, or any thing elſe, he

can

can make a Shrowd large enough to cover the Infamy of his own D---. If (according to the saying) *a word to the Wise is enough*; I presume, to a **Cunning-Man**, a Letter of a Word may be enough: And therefore shall forbear to say more on that Subject, till further Occasion be given.

T. E.

The End.

ERRATA.

P. 16. *l.* 28. *r.* the fifty. *p.* 17. *l.* 16. for are, *r.* use. *p.* 25. *l.* 19. for where, *r.* whose. *p.* 43 l. 8. for would, *r.* could. *p.* 46. *l.* 15. *r.* did it. *p.* 49. *l.* 25. for have, *r.* heard. *p.* 50. l. 27. *r.* we intend. *p.* 54. *l.* 9. for writing, *r.* reciting. *p.* 57. *l.* 12. after unbelievers *r.* &c. *p.* 58. l. 6. for here, *r.* hence. *p.* 62. l. last, dele that. *p.* 64. l. 27. after part, *r.* in. *p.* 69. l. 16. *r.* Papists. l. 21. *r.* into the. *p.* 77. l. 12. for there, *r.* either. *p.* 88. l. 15. *r.* declare. *p.* 89. l. 26. for instance *r.* inconse. *p.* 91. l. 11. *r.* work *p.* 94. l. 13. *r.* relating to. *p.* 97. l. 21. *r.* God and Christ. *p.* 115. *l.* 9. for hat, *r.* hath.